

# Concordia Theological Monthly

---

Vol. XI

JULY, 1940

No. 7

---

## Reason or Revelation?

(Continued)

### II

There are more rationalists in the churches than go by that name. It is not a nice name. Rationalism is, as we have shown in the preceding articles, an ugly, wicked thing. It sets itself above Scripture, above God. Who would want to proclaim himself a rationalist? Our Liberals indeed are not ashamed of the name. But the great majority of theologians dislikes it. However, many of them, very many of them, are doing the very same thing the rationalists have been doing, and they do it because they like it. They fall into two groups. The first group, made up of those who carry on their rationalistic business under an alias, is the subject of the present article. In the following article we shall deal with those who strongly insist on the *sola Scriptura* but still engage in rationalistic practices.

The first group recognizes other authorities besides Scripture, but does not name reason, that is, natural reason, as such an additional source and norm of the Christian teaching. What it enthrones as authority in religion is introduced under the name of "*enlightened reason*." These men tell us that natural reason, the authority of the rationalists, is blind in spiritual matters but that the enlightened reason of the Christian, regenerate reason, is capable of judging spiritual matters and must be permitted to sit in judgment on Scripture. These men say: "The source from which the dogmatician gets his material is his reason, enlightened through revelation. . . . So there is a threefold source of the Christian doctrine, the enlightened reason of the dogmatician, the teaching of the Church, and the canonical Scripture of the Old and the New Testament." (See Baier, *Compendium*, I, p. 91.) John De Witt tells us: "Our enlightened moral instinct rejects it un-

reservedly and forever." (*What Is Inspiration?* P. 180.)<sup>1)</sup> A. H. Strong: "The science of theology is a product of reason, but of reason as including a power of recognizing God which is practically inseparable from a love of God." (*Syst. Theol.*, p. 3.) Modern theology—liberal and conservative—is obsessed with the idea that in regeneration reason receives additional powers, so that it can understand, more or less, the mysteries of God and is privileged to sit in judgment on Scripture.

Nothing of the kind takes place in regeneration. 2 Cor. 10:5 ("bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ") is addressed to the Christians, too. They understand the mystery of the Trinity and the mystery of inspiration as little as the unchristians. What takes place in regeneration is that the Christian receives the power to put his reason into subjection to Scripture. When a Christian is tempted to criticize Scripture and to set his own thoughts above Revelation, it is not his regenerate mind but the old unregenerate Adam that is speaking. In the words of Dr. Walther: "Nor can enlightened and regenerate reason be made the source and norm of religious knowledge, equal and on a level with Scripture. For the nature of an enlightened and regenerate reason consists just in this, that it does not make itself but Scripture the source of knowledge in matters of faith, 2 Cor. 10:5. Besides, in no man is there to be found, in this life, a perfectly enlightened and regenerate reason, Gen. 18:10-15." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 13, p. 99. *Vier Thesen ueber das Schriftprinzip*.) Even Dr. Robert Jelke

---

1) In order to show how this "regenerate" reason works and what wickedness it is capable of, we shall transcribe the entire passage. "We go fearlessly to the old inspiration, approving or rejecting, as it may be. If anything agrees not with these words of Christ in the gospels and with the life of God incarnate, we renounce and denounce it as evil. Our enlightened moral instinct rejects it unreservedly and forever. Any disciple of Christ that does not speak according to this word knows not what spirit he is of. Let him come closer to Christ in His pervasive, effluent, and communicative moral purity. Let him take John's position, pillowing his head on the Master's bosom, where he can hear His faintest whisper and feel every throb of His pure, tender, and loving heart, and he will come to a better mind" and repudiate the doctrine of verbal inspiration. We ought to quote the preceding paragraphs, too, because they show where "enlightened reason" and those who operate with it really belong: "If, besides the divine truth that the Old Testament embodies, it also contains partial truths, which are sometimes as misleading as falsehoods, and moral incongruities and monstrosities from which our souls recoil, how shall I separate the gold from the dross? By the use of my reason? Would you have me become a rationalist? Yes, rather than be a sophist or simpleton. Yes, a thousand times, if one becomes a rationalist by making use of his reason, including conscience and every spiritual faculty with which God has endowed him, strengthened and enlightened by the Word and life and spirit of Christ. Who will fling a gibe at us for such rationalism, a rationalism that verges so closely upon inspiration?" We are going to say the same thing—men who operate with the "enlightened" reason are rationalists.

points this out to his colleagues: "They appeal, not to corrupt reason, but to reason as renewed through the Word of God. But they forget that the decision as to whether reason is renewed or regenerate must be taken solely from the Word of God and that accordingly the real categories of revelation must be derived not from formal reason but from the Word of God." (*Vernunft und Offenbarung*, p. 36.) Long ago J. Gerhard upheld this correct principle over against the Reformed. He wrote: "But,' they say, 'you must distinguish between the regenerate and the unregenerate reason.' Bucanus asks: 'Is all authority to be denied human reason and the principles of philosophy in determining the nature of Christ's body?' and answers: 'In so far as human reason received spiritual qualities in regeneration, it can bear true testimony. . . .' We answer: Regenerate reason must believe and judge concerning the articles of faith according to God's Word; else it ceases to be regenerate." (See *Lehre u. Wehre*, 26, p. 260; 21, p. 35.)

Putting the tag "enlightened" on reason may hide, but does not change, the situation. These men are rationalists pure and simple. One who presumes to make the cogitations, ruminations, and dictates of his own mind equally authoritative with the teachings of Scripture, pleading that these cogitations are inspired by the Holy Spirit, and actually changes the Scripture teaching to suit these cogitations, has fallen a prey to the same pride of *carnal* reason as dominates Roehr and Fosdick. As Dr. Pieper says: "When modern theologians make the 'regenerate ego' the principle of Christian knowledge and at the same time refuse to accept Scripture as the Word of God and the sole source and norm of theology, they are in reality placing the *natural* ego of man, the flesh, upon the seat of authority in the Church. It is plain, common *rationalism* masquerading as Christianity." (*Chr. Dog.*, I, p. 242.) Dr. Stoeckhardt: "The theology of F. H. R. Frank, which takes up the cudgels against the rationalism of Ritschl, is itself nothing but a new form and edition of rationalism, rationalism in a churchly dress. It is the *natural* reason, which in the systems of Frank pulls the Christian truths to pieces after its own particular fashion, dissects them, and fashions them together again, harmonizes them." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 42, p. 74.) And Dr. De Witt agrees whole-heartedly with Pieper and Stoeckhardt. We heard him say: Brethren, let us admit it! When we use our spiritual faculties, enlightened by the Word and spirit of Jesus, in arriving at the true doctrine of inspiration, we are—and we say it proudly—rationalists.

This form of rationalism is a wicked, monstrous thing, just as is the common kind. It amounts to an insult of the new man, the good Christian, to expect of him to set his cogitations on a par with the teachings of Scripture. What a satanic presumption it is

to assume the right to amend and change and improve what the Holy Spirit has set down in Scripture once for all! But do these men really reject plain teachings of Scripture in the name and by authority of their illuminated reason? De Witt, having pillowed his head on the Master's bosom, finds that he cannot accept the doctrine of the verbal, plenary inspiration of Scripture. His soul recoils from the moral incongruities and monstrosities of the Old Testament. And his is no exceptional case. Dr. H. C. Alleman feels the same way. He says: "When we read Old Testament stories of doubtful ethics and *lex talionis* reprisals, with their cruelty and vengefulness, their polygamy and adultery, it is difficult for us to sympathize with the theory of verbal inspiration." (*Luth. Church Quarterly*, 1936, p. 24.) In fact, all theologians who operate with "enlightened" reason, have discarded this doctrine. They feel compelled to separate the gold from the dross (De Witt's phrase), the kernel from the husk (Alleman's phrase). And this is not the only doctrine with which "enlightened" reason is out of sympathy. It feels and acts just like carnal reason. Give the reign to "enlightened reason," and it will ride rough-shod over all Christian doctrines. "It is a fatal aberration," said Walther, to make enlightened reason the source and norm of Christian teaching. — We shall revert to this later on.

Other aliases are *Christian consciousness*, *Christian experience*, *faith*, *spirit*. These terms are synonyms of "enlightened reason," and we are discussing them separately only because they are used more frequently. "Christian experience" — that is the one great authority for modern theologians. "Out of the stuff of human life, theology is born." We all are acquainted with the classic dictum of Hofmann, the Lutheran: "Ich, der Christ, bin mir, dem Theologen, der Stoff meiner Wissenschaft."<sup>2)</sup> Edwin E. Aubrey, of the

2) Just now *Churches and Sects of Christendom*, by J. L. Neve, came to hand. We read on page 242: "But was Schleiermacher right in his very attractive suggestion of developing the substance of dogmatics out of the religious experience of the theologian? Agreement on this point was expressed by F. H. R. Frank, leading systematician of the Erlangen school. In the defense of this position Frank made use of a thought in the Hegelian realm of philosophy (Fichte). He discussed the matter of his *System of Christian Certainty*. Following Fichte's distinction between the 'I' and the 'Non-I,' he established himself upon the principle: I, the theologian, have as the object of my reflection the inner consciousness of myself as a Christian. In other words, the dogmatician will not describe objectively what he finds in Scripture (as was done in the dogmatics of the Loci), but practically he will describe subjectively the contents of his own inner experience of the Christian truth. Hofmann was in partial agreement with Frank. Some of the Erlangen school have steered more to the right from this principle. . . . R. Seeberg led further to the left by making the reflecting dogmatician, on the basis of his own findings, the criterion of truth." In a footnote Neve adds: "See C. E. Luthardt, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre*, pp. 90 ff., and cf. F. Pieper's sharp critique of Frank in his *Dogmatik*, Vol. I."



University of Chicago, put it into good English: "Out of the stuff of human life, theology is born" and then goes on to tell us what he and Hofmann and the rest of the experientialists mean: "The early Christian records are themselves built out of Christian experience. . . . Ever new insights born of Christian experiences enlarge the system [of Christian theology] and give it greater relevance to all men's lives. . . . It is the contribution of church-fellowship to theology that it infuses the Christian system with the personal experience of its members." (*Living the Christian Faith*, pp. 36, 72, 74.) Scripture alone does not suffice for the establishment of the Christian religion and the maintenance of Christian theology. Christian experience must contribute its part. R. Jelke tells us: "In establishing the truth of the Christian religion, theology needs factors which are not at the disposal of the philosophy of religion. These factors lie in the own personal experience of the Christian subject. And to take account of the individual personal experience of the Christian, of that experience which made him a Christian, and to utilize it for the establishing of the truth of Christianity, that is the peculiar business of the theologian. He must point out on what foundation faith rests." (*Die Grunddogmen des Christentums*, p. 2.)<sup>3)</sup> Another pertinent statement, from the *Lutheran Church Review* (General Council): "The Missouri position . . . mistakes the Scripture, which is the only rule of faith, as the only source of religion. . . . The Word has always been before, and in small part at least, outside of and beyond the Scriptures. Where, then, has this small part at least been lodged? In regenerate human consciousness. Where has it manifested itself? In regenerate human experience, which God does not despise, as much as some of His representatives have. . . . Scripture itself shows that 'the answer to God's Word in human consciousness is a part of God's revelation to the world.' This is a fact in spite of what the Missouri writer says about Peter, Paul, and John receiving the message, doctrine, and words direct from the Holy Ghost." (See *Theol. Quarterly*, I, p. 371 f.) The Christian-experience theology does indeed place the Christian consciousness beside Scripture as a coordinate authority and establishes it as a legitimate source and norm of the Christian doctrine. H. Wheeler Robinson speaks in the name of all experientialists when he states "that religious experience is to be taken as the starting-point of theological reconstruction." (*The Chr. Experience of the Holy Spirit*, p. VII.)

"Theological reconstruction," yes, and even the Bible needs to

---

3) Compare this with the statement of Jelke quoted above and try to harmonize it.

be reconstructed. You cannot base theology on the Scriptures as they lie before you. How much of the Bible is true? What parts of it are God's Word? Your Christian consciousness must tell you that. W. B. Berkenmeyer: "We must judge Scripture by Christ. . . . Spirit and life cannot be preserved or handed down in words—only in lives." (*The Luth. Church Quarterly*, 1938, p. 69.) "Christ," "spirit," Christian consciousness, will tell you what portions of the Bible must be deleted. G. T. Ladd: "It belongs to the Church, in every age, to examine the sacred writings by the light both of tradition and of its own spiritually illumined self-consciousness. By the light of tradition each age discovers what the previous ages have considered to be canonical Scriptures; by the light of its own spiritually illumined consciousness it discovers the Word of God within those Scriptures. . . . The Church has the right of rejecting from this Word whatever does not satisfy the demands of its ethico-religious consciousness. . . . The New Testament is in nearly all its extent the vehicle of the divine Word of salvation." The Old Testament "contains many divine words"; nevertheless it "contains also many statements of fact and doctrine which are not thus established, confirmed, and approbated." (See B. Mauly, *The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration*, p. 50 f.) And the Lutheran theologian E. Schaefer (in Breslau) agrees with this: "The Spirit-wrought faith applies a sifting process to the Bible-word. Through this sifting process it gets the Word of God, the Word of Christ, to which it pneumatically adheres." (*Theozentrische Theologie*, II, page 69.)

The Christian self-consciousness reconstructs the Bible, and what is left of the Bible you believe not because Scripture assures you of it, but because your experience says so. Some experientialists have left the doctrine of the Virgin Birth intact. But how do we know that Jesus was indeed born of the Virgin? R. Jelke assures us that "the chief faith-experience (*das zentrale Glaubenserlebnis*) of the Christian, which leads us to see the uniqueness of the Savior, compels us by the same inner necessity to accept the dogma that Jesus was born, by the power of the Holy Spirit, of the Virgin; in other words, the innermost heart of our faith can and does make us certain not only of the *realitas incarnationis* but also of a specific *modus incarnationis*." (*Grunddogmen*, p. 108.)

Furthermore, this reconstructed Bible is not up to date. Certain doctrines have not yet been fully revealed. We sort of talk about them, but Christian experience has not yet spoken the final word. A. F. C. Vilmar, another Lutheran, conservative, too, after stating that, "while the objective source of dogmatics is the revelation of God in Christ, the subjective source is experience, the personal participation in those divine facts," goes on to declare that "the

further experiences that lie before us have to do with the *essence of the Church* and with the Last Things, with *Eschatology*. . . . This doctrine is one of those which must yet be experienced, and we are living in the age in which this experience is to come to pass." (*Dogmatik*, I, pp. 4, 7; II, p. 181.) This means, of course, that what we have been teaching on the subjects of the Church and of the Last Things before 1874 was guesswork. — Christian experience is indeed made a source and *the* norm of Christian teaching.

And that is rationalism. "Christian consciousness" is a reality, a blessed reality, and it speaks out with a loud voice, but in the role it is made to play by the experientialists it is simply a synonym for reason. When it is made to sit in judgment on Scripture, it is simply a dummy, uttering the speech of reason. When Ladd and Schaeder apply their sifting process to Scripture, rejecting certain statements and doctrines as unacceptable, it is not the Christian consciousness which is directing them, — for the conscience and mind of the Christian, created by the Holy Spirit, cannot reject anything spoken by the Holy Spirit, — but their carnal, proud reason. What else can dominate their thoughts? They will not say that the Holy Ghost is giving them new revelations. They do not want to write themselves down as Quakers and Muenzerites. Nor will they want to say that their cogitations and demonstrations are disordered dreaming and empty babbling. No, no, when a man refuses to accept a teaching of the Bible, it is because something makes him say: It *cannot* be true; it *must* be something different. And that is the voice of reason. The same applies to the theory of the further development of doctrine or the discovery of new doctrines.

H. Sasse puts these men in their place: "Who is the judge that will tell me in cases of doubt where Christ and where only Scripture speaks? Have I not, then, made my reason, which speaks through my ethico-religious feeling, the *norma normans* of Christian teaching?" (See *Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenz.*, Feb. 18, 1938.) The Baptist A. H. Strong comes to the same conclusion; his diagnosis of the situation is unanswerable: "The illumination theory holds, not that the Bible is, but that it contains, the Word of God. . . . An inspiration of this sort still leaves us destitute of any authoritative standard of truth and duty. An additional revelation would, upon this theory, still be needed to tell us what parts are true and binding. Since no such additional revelation is given us, the individual *reason* must determine what parts of Scripture it is to receive and what to reject. The theory in effect makes reason, and not the Scriptures, the ultimate authority in morals and religion." (*Syst. Theol.*, p. 99 f.) Dr. Craig, writing in

the *Presbyterian*, October 11, 1928, passes the same judgment: "By Christian consciousness is meant that we cannot be under obligation to accept anything in religion that is not real to this high tribunal, before which all cases in question must be brought. . . . Those who insist that the Christian consciousness, which is another phrase for the human reason, is the final court, do not seem to see that this is veneered Rationalism, pure and simple, and so must ultimately lead to the same goal." Dr. Walther said the same thing. "It is absolutely necessary that we maintain the doctrine of inspiration as taught by our orthodox dogmaticians. If the possibility that Scripture contained the least error were admitted, it would become the business of *man* to sift the truth from the error. That places man over Scripture. Scripture is no longer the source and norm of faith. Human reason is made the *norma* of the truth, and Scripture is degraded to the position of a *norma normata*. The least deviation from the old inspiration doctrine introduces a *rationalistic* germ into theology and infects the whole body of doctrine." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 1888, p. 196.)<sup>4)</sup>

"It ultimately leads to the same goal." Experientialism deals with the Christian doctrine exactly as rationalism has dealt with it. It does away with the doctrine of inspiration, as we have seen, and so destroys all certainty, objective and subjective certainty. And it does away with other doctrines, as we shall point out in a moment.

A third alias is "*scientific theology*." This alias, however, does not cover up much; for when those who operate with the "enlightened reason," the "Christian self-consciousness," etc., describe their theology as a science and then tell us what they mean by this term, they identify themselves quite plainly as rationalists. Scientific theology aims to elevate faith to knowledge. "Modern theologians want to *prove* as absolute truth what the common people merely *believe*." (Walther, *Law and Gospel*, p. 235.) They set out to vindicate the teachings of Christianity before the scientific mind, which, as we know, will not take anything on trust. Further, theology must be made into a system, where everything is deduced from a central truth and all parts form a harmonious whole. Reason has decided that the Bible contains contradictory teachings; so it is the business of the scientific theologian to construct a well-ordered system in which the various doctrines fit into each other. "Since the modern theologians conceive of theology as the science

---

4) When men, adding to the Bible "supplementary sources and norms of Christian belief," name as such "natural reason and Christian experience" (see page 324, current volume of *C.T.M.*), they are committing tautology. They should say: Natural reason, speaking in its own name, or natural reason speaking in the name of Christian experience.

of Christianity, they would have the Christian doctrines form a whole such as reason demands." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 34, p. 327.) And, finally, the central truth, the truth which seems best fitted to meet all requirements, is the experience of the Christian, the initial experience, which is faith, and whatever other experiences flow from faith and express themselves in the Christian consciousness. Scientific theology makes the Christian experience a source of Christian knowledge and the norm according to which the Bible-teachings are to be evaluated, judged, modified, and harmonized.

Let the scientific theologians speak for themselves. Canon B. I. Bell speaks, as usual, plain language. "Theology is an attempt by philosophers to systematize and interpret the results of revelation and of religious experimentation." (*The Living Church*, Sept. 12, 1936.) In *A History of the Doctrine of the Works of Christ* R. S. Franks refuses to quote any but those who made an effort "to reduce the doctrine to systematic unity," and that is, says the *Theol. Monthly* (I, p. 154), what our age calls "scientific method." Luthardt, the Lutheran, also defines theology as "the churchly science of Christianity" and demands that "theology must genetically develop the whole of Christian doctrine from a fundamental unit." In Luthardt-Jelke's *Kompendium der Dogmatik* we read: "While it is the business of the Church simply to proclaim to mankind the gracious revelation of God, theology is required to justify the message of the Church scientifically." (11th edition, p. 5.) And in his *Die Grunddogmen des Christentums*, p. 84, Jelke speaks of "the naive way in which the New Testament presents, side by side, the deity and the humanity of Jesus," goes on to say that theology must be more than "a reproduction of New Testament thoughts," and then states blandly: "At this point the work of the dogmatician begins. He must show how the statements concerning the person of Christ must be formulated if they are to stand before the judgment of the modern scientific consciousness." (Compare this with his statement quoted a few pages back.) S. Goebel, Reformed, treats the doctrine of inspiration exactly as Jelke wants to have the doctrine of the person of Christ treated. He rejects the doctrine of verbal inspiration, for such a doctrine "is in direct conflict with the living facts which lie before us in the past and present experience of the Church and are ever being authenticated in the consciousness of the believing Church. Such a doctrine stubbornly ignores the realities and is thus in opposition to a fundamental requirement of true science. . . . The divine authority of Scripture does not cover such records and regulations as are not at all or not closely related to God's self-revelation in Christ." (*Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kz.*, 1926, No. 39, 43.) The article en-

titled "The Place of Scientific Method in Theology," published in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* of April, 1939, after stating that "all the principal theological formulations of the Christian churches have been wrought out in an age or in ages that were prescientific in their conscious interests, ideals, and methods," that "the *Loci* of John Gerhard necessarily retained in many parts the serious limitations of a prescientific heritage both in method and conclusions," mentioning in this connection "the old atomistic method of proof-texts," makes the following declarations: "Schleiermacher's greatest contribution was the restoration to theology of the *religious consciousness as a controlling principle*." (Italics ours.) "His defect was his insufficient appreciation of revelation and his underrating of the objective side of faith. But his zeal for science gave rise to phenomenal progress in the utilization by all branches of theology of scientific method." "The day for compartmentalizing and isolating theology from the rest of human thinking and knowing has long passed. . . . The business of theology has always been to define what is of faith and what is contrary to faith. But such definitions cannot come to rest in isolation from the total existing body of human knowledge." "What the Christian Church and especially the Lutheran Church has done more or less consciously from the beginning, shaping her theology ever anew upon the anvil of divinely given Fact, . . . she may now do with awakened and alert scientific consciousness, reverencing every God-made fact, whether in the deposit of her faith or in the constitution of the world." You will notice that the scientific theologians deal little with the Scriptures. They deal with Facts! And the controlling principle is not the "It is written" but the religious consciousness. The *Lutheran Church Quarterly* is following in the footsteps of the *Lutheran Church Review*. The statements quoted above: "The Scriptures are not the only source. . . . The Word is, in small part at least, outside of the Scriptures," which Word is "lodged in regenerate human consciousness," developed the theme: "Theology is the science of a saving faith." Reviewing this article, the *Theological Quarterly* (I, p. 369) quotes Frank, a leader of the scientific-theology school: "It is our right to demand that nothing which is itself an object of cognition and lies without the cognizing subject be pointed out to us as a principle of cognition." He denies that Scripture is the source of *Christian ethics*, saying: "It is equally manifest that in this question as to the principle of cognition we can adduce nothing which is objectively given us, for example, the Holy Scriptures or the decrees of the Church, but *solely* that moral self-consciousness. . . . The *Quarterly* comments: "This is scientific theology in the modern sense of the term."—The theological scientist does not bother much with the Bible,



much less with isolated proof-texts, but he sits down and studies Facts. He finds within himself and within others a great Fact: he believes in Christ, he focuses his mind, his reason, on this phenomenon, studies its reaction to other Facts and to the doctrines of the Bible, and what he thus observes — or imagines that he observes — he presents to the Church as the assured results of the science of theology, as God's truth.

In God's name, why don't they call themselves plain rationalists and be done with it? Theirs is the rationalistic principle, theirs the pride of carnal reason; and they do not fall far short of the rationalists in the havoc they create among the Christian doctrines. Their principle is the same as that of rationalism. They refuse to say: *Credo, quia scriptum est*. They say: *Credo, quia intelligo*, or, *Credo, ut intelligam*. They do not use the term "reason," but saying that their Christian self-consciousness *understands* these things and understands them so well that it can put the truth in better shape than Scripture has left it, is saying that the human mind rules Scripture — and that was the principle of *rationalismus vulgaris*.<sup>5)</sup>

Theirs is the pride of reason. The true Christian consciousness willingly *submits* to Scripture. It is wicked pride to make "the Christian self-consciousness" the "controlling principle" of theology and Scripture. The theologian has lost his Christian balance who feels that it is beneath him simply to "*reproduce* New Testament thoughts," simply to repeat what God says in Scripture. We need not point out that it requires quite a lot of conceit for the theologians to say that they have a better grasp of the Christian truth than the common Christians. We shall have to point out to them that in this respect they are on the same level with the laymen. The common Christian grasps the truths of Scripture with exactly the same faith as the Christian theologian. (And if the theologian insists that he has a better grasp because he is better trained in logic and philosophy, we tell him: That is it exactly; you are a rationalist.) — Dr. Pieper says on this head: "This attempt to elevate faith into knowledge springs from the idea that the 'theologian,' in contradistinction to the rest of the Christians, may

5) Dr. Bente: "Theologians of the Middle Ages said: *Credo, quia intelligo*. But one who will only believe what he can comprehend and know as truth through his reason is a rationalist, like our Liberals. Others said: *Credo, ut intelligam*. But like every Christian, so also the theologian is bound to the authoritative word of Scripture — *Credo, quia scriptum est* — which he can receive and know as true only by faith. Theologians therefore who have the notion that they can grasp the simple Christian faith with their reason and thus elevate faith to knowledge are headed towards rationalism. This is the course pursued also by the conservative scientific theologians, particularly of Germany." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 70, p. 247.)



possess a knowledge of the Christian religion which *exceeds* faith in God's revelation in the Word. Christ and Paul stamp this notion as false; Christ, who will have all knowledge of religious truth mediated by faith in His Word; and Paul, who characterizes every man, especially the *teacher* in the Church, who does not consent to the words of Christ as a conceited ignoramus (τετόφωτα, μὴ ἐπιστάμενος), 1 Tim. 6:3 ff." (*Chr. Dogmatik*, I, p. 18.)

And now, how does the Christian doctrine fare at the hands of the theologians who operate with the enlightened reason, the Christian experience, in their scientific theology? It is not safe with them, as little as with the old rationalists. The old rationalists indeed made a clean sweep of it. The scientific theologians, the enlightened-reason men, have not cast everything overboard. But that is not due to their system. It is owing to the grace of God. Dr. Stoeckhardt, having unmasked Frank's theology as rationalistic, goes on to say: "It is indeed a miracle that Frank's mill of reason did not grind *all* Christian dogmas to pieces, that Frank retains certain elements of the Christian truth. But for that his system is not responsible. It is due to an inconsistency." (*Lehre u. Wehre*, 42, p. 74.) The mysteries of the Christian faith are just as repulsive to the "enlightened" reason as the natural reason. If the "Christian consciousness" of the scientific theologian had its way, it would do away with all Christian doctrines. As it is, it has gone very far. Jelke has retained the doctrine of the Virgin Birth in spite of his scientific method; but, applying his scientific method, he cuts the heart out of the doctrine of the vicarious satisfaction: "Man darf die Versöhnung nicht mit einer aeusserlich-juridischen Strafsatisfaktion gleichstellen, bei der Gottes Gerechtigkeit durch Uebertragung von Schuld und Strafe auf den Unschuldigen befriedigt sein soll. Die Gottheit Christi kann recht eigentlich auch gar nicht als das *immense pretium* in Betracht kommen, das Gott geboten wird." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 53, 62.) Hofmann, permitting his Christian self-consciousness to control Scripture, denied original sin. And he denied the vicarious satisfaction. The scientific theologians are unanimous in the repudiation and denunciation of the doctrine of verbal, plenary inspiration. In short, as the German theologian Muenkel declared in 1862 (quoted by Dr. Walther in *Lehre u. Wehre*, 21, p. 71): "Hardly a single doctrine is left which has not suffered modification, alteration, addition, and amputation." "Whither has this theology drifted? An inspiration which is not the inspiration of the Bible; a word of God, which is not the *word* of God nor the word of *God*; a God, who is not the God of His word; a Trinity which is not a unity; a Son who is not *the* Son, begotten of the Father from eternity, very God of very God; a Christ, who is not *the* Christ, the Son of God made of a woman;

a redemption which cannot redeem for want of a Redeemer, God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; a salvation by grace which is not by grace—such are some of the achievements of scientific theology." (A. Graebner, in the *Theological Quarterly*, I, p. 5.) Long ago Luther raised the warning cry: "*Ratio inimica fidei*." (IX:157.) Experience has shown that the "enlightened" reason of the scientific theologian is capable of the same crimes as the natural reason of Roehr and Semler. Listen to Luther: "If you would philosophize in Aristotle without harm, you must first have become a fool, a whole fool, in Christ." (XVIII:39.) Unless you are willing to take your reason captive, the scientific method of Aristotle will make fools of you, unable to study Scripture. And if you will not listen to Luther, listen to what one of your own men, Edwin Aubrey, is telling you: "When revelation is made plausible by reason, not much remains of the authority of revelation." (*Op. cit.*, p. 70.)

There is another variety of theology which belongs to our first group, to that group which carries on its rationalistic business under an alias. That is the theology of Rome. In its official declarations Rome refrains from naming reason as one of its sources of supply. It names four sources: Holy Scripture, tradition, the Church or the councils, the Pope.<sup>6</sup>) Nothing said about reason. And Catholic theologians insist that reason has no voice in their theology. Cardinal Gibbons tells us: "Is, then, the power and mercy of God to be measured by the narrow rule of human understanding? Is the Almighty not permitted to do anything except what we can sanction by our reason? Is a thing declared to be impossible because we cannot see its possibility? . . . You tell me

6) Four sources, according to the official count. In reality there is but one principle of cognition in Romish theology. Just as the rationalists and the rationalizing theologians name two authorities, Scripture and reason, or Scripture and the Christian experience, but subordinate Scripture to reason and experience and thus operate with the *sola ratio*, so the Romanists, in spite of counting four authorities and putting Scripture at the head, rely on only one authority, one chief and final judge. Who is that? Sometimes they say it is the Church. A recent publication, "The Truth about Catholics," says: "Has God given us the means to know what He has taught? 'Yes,' say all Protestants, 'He has.' And so say the Catholics. 'The Bible,' say our Protestant friends, 'and nothing but the Bible.' But we Catholics say, 'No; not the Bible but the Church of God.'" (P. 2.) According to this authority, which carries the episcopal imprimatur, the Church is the real authority. If you should ask the Pope, he would say: "No, I am the real source of Christian teaching." "I am the tradition," said Pius IX. And not only since 1870 but from the very beginning "the Pope boasts that all rights exist in the shrine of his heart, and whatever he decides and commands with[in] his Church is spirit and right." (Smalc. Art. *Trigl.*, p. 495.) *The Truth about Catholics* would, if pressed, soon say: That is what our statement really means.—The Catholics have but one authority in religion, and that is—reason, as will appear in a moment.

it is a mystery above your comprehension. A mystery indeed. A religion that rejects a revealed truth because it is incomprehensible contains in itself the seed of dissolution and will end in rationalism. . . . I understand why rationalists, who admit nothing above their reason, reject the Real Presence; but that Bible Christians should reject it is to me incomprehensible." (*The Faith of Our Fathers*, ch. XXI.) *America*, February 25, 1939, declares: "The Catholic Church seems to be above reason. It always admits that there is a place for reason in ordinary matters, but that beyond them no human mind can hope to know the answers. The priest need not rely upon his own authority, his own ingenuity. The answers to all questions have been accumulating for two thousand years, and he knows where to find them." He will find them in those three additional storehouses — tradition, Church, Pope. But, we ask, where does the Pope find that additional religious truth which the Bible does not furnish? There is nothing left but reason. The Pope may not like that word. Others of like mind do not like it, as we have seen. They call it enlightened reason or Christian experience. And the Pope may, in addition, speak of a special illumination, special revelations, a special kind of inspiration. But all that the Pope offers us when he goes beyond and against Scripture is the wisdom of carnal reason. His theology is that of *rationalismus vulgaris*.

We mean exactly that. The cardinal doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church is exactly the same as that which the crass rationalists taught. It is the doctrine of salvation through man's own efforts, conversion through exercising the powers of free will, justification by works. And the source of this doctrine is reason. "Human reason naturally admires these" (good works), "and because it sees only works and does not understand or consider faith, it dreams accordingly that these works merit remission of sins and justify. This opinion of the Law inheres by nature in men's minds." (Apology. *Trigl.*, p. 197.) "Human wisdom gazes at the Law and seeks in it justification. Accordingly, also the scholastic doctors, great and talented men, proclaim this as the highest work of the Law, and ascribe to this work justification." (*Op. cit.*, p. 183.) Carnal reason can teach nothing but salvation through man's own contrivance; and whoever teaches that has no other teacher but carnal reason. There is no essential difference between the Pope and the crass rationalists: both are faithful disciples of Pelagius. Oh, yes, there are Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians. But both, the old rationalists (Pelagians) and the Catholic theologians (Semi-Pelagians), are one in praising the powers of free will. It matters not that one class of Pelagians describes these powers as weakened and undiminished and the others as attenuated. Both

make these powers decisive for salvation. The Synod of Trent "declares that free will, attenuated as it was in its powers and bent down, was by no means extinguished in them," the children of fallen Adam, and: "If any one saith that, since Adam's sin the free will of man is lost and extinguished or that it is a thing with only a name, yea, a name without a reality, a figment, in fine, introduced into the Church by Satan, let him be anathema." And: "Man's free will disposes and prepares itself for obtaining the grace of justification." (Sessio VI.) Rome learned that from Pelagius, and Pelagius learned it from reason, "Pelagius, the venerable defender of reason against unreason." It is against reason, derogatory of the worth of man, to teach justification by faith. So said Pelagius and the rationalists; so says Rome. Characterizing rationalism, Dr. Pieper says: "The theological work of the rationalists centered and consisted in this: to show that pure Scripture, that is, Scripture interpreted by reason, is nothing but a lofty teaching of morality, as exemplified by Jesus." (*Chr. Dog.*, I, p. 323.) And what is the center and the aim of the Pope's theological work? To show that man, assisted by Jesus, can achieve his salvation through good works. Pure Catholicism is rationalism, pure and simple.<sup>7)</sup>

Catholic theology has planted itself squarely upon the *articulus fundamentalissimus* of rationalism, salvation through the exercise of man's power, and it supports this article with rationalistic arguments. It employs the argument of reason: Since man brings about his perdition, it must also be man who achieves his salvation. And it makes copious use of the argument: Since Scripture commands man to turn to the Lord, it ascribes to him the power to bring about his conversion. Said Erasmus, the spokesman of the Pope: "If what is commanded be not in the power of every one, all the numberless exhortations in the Scriptures and also all the promises, threatenings, expostulations, reproofs, asseverations, benedictions, and maledictions, together with all the forms of precepts, must of necessity stand coldly useless." Unless Scripture recognizes free will in man, these imperative statements of the Bible would involve an absurdity. He kept harping on this, and Luther kept telling him: "At one time you fly to the interpretations of the Fathers; at another, to absurdities of reason." (Luther, XVIII:1796, 1887.) Trent made much of this argument of reason: "God commands

7) Read up in *Lehre und Wehre*, 49, p. 211 ff., on this point. Dr. Bente describes the rationalism of the Gnostics, the rationalism of the scholastics, the "orgies of the rationalism of the 18th century," and adds: "Rationalismus ist im Grunde auch der Papismus und Enthusiasmus." He points out that the Pope asserts that all spiritual truth is enclosed in *scrinio sui pectoris* (Smalc. Art., p. 495) and concludes: "Das ist grober Rationalismus."

not impossibilities" (Sessio VI, chap. XI), and the Catholics keep harping on it. *The Truth about Catholics* says: "Was Luther a man to be depended upon in the great concern of religion? If so, why did God permit him to fall into so many absurdities in point of doctrine? He says: 'Thou shalt not covet' is a commandment which proves us all to be sinners since it is not in any man's power not to covet; and the same is the drift of all the commandments, for they are all equally impossible to us.' (*De Lib. Chris*, Tom. 4, p. 2.) . . . Here is God represented as a merciless tyrant commanding things which we have it not in our power to perform." (P. 9.) Catholic theology insists that, if anything seems absurd to reason, it cannot be true. And it applies this rationalistic axiom to other doctrines. It denies the *communicatio naturarum* in Christ, for *finitum non est capax infiniti*. It operates with the principle that, if a thing is true in physics, it is true in theology. The human body contains blood, therefore the communicants who receive the true body of Christ have no need of receiving the cup (concomitance). Again, Mary must be conceived without sin because "God would not let a body in which His Son would dwell have a stain of sin, which would indeed have communicated itself in a way to the Son." (Wilmers, *Lehrbuch der Religion*, 2, p. 180.) *Popular Symbolics* lists these and other instances and says: "The theology of Rome is shot through and through with rationalism. Reasonableness is the claim she makes for her system of doctrine." (P. 157.)

She swears by Aristotle. Luther: "But perhaps they will say: 'From Aristotle we learn that in an affirmative proposition subject and predicate must be identical,' or, to set down the beast's own words, 'An affirmative proposition demands the agreement of subject and predicate,' etc." And thus they have established transubstantiation! Luther adds: "What shall we say when Aristotle and the doctrines of men are made to be arbiters of these lofty and divine things?" (XIX:28.) And they are riding the same beast today. Pohle-Preuss, *Series of Dogmatic Text-books*, IX, p. 109, is applying the same Aristotelian dialectics in presenting the teaching of Rome on this point: "In the Holy Eucharist we have a true conversion. What disappears is the substance of bread and wine, which constitutes the *terminus formalis a quo*. Nor can the *terminus totalis ad quem* be said to be newly created," etc. Read the whole dreary passage for yourself in *Conc. Theol. M.*, X, p. 804.

Is a theology of this sort rationalistic or not? Why, there are plenty of Catholic theologians who distinctly claim reasonableness for their system of doctrine, let Gibbons say what he will. According to the scholastic Richard of St. Victor it is the province of theology, "*quod tenemus ex fide, ratione apprehendere et demon-*

*strativa certitudinis attestazione firmare.*" And Quenstedt was right in saying: "*Theologia scholasticorum est mera mixtura theologiae et philosophiae.*" (See *Lehre u. Wehre*, 49, p. 209.) An article entitled "Why I Am a Catholic" states: "I am a Catholic because the Church is the divinely appointed means to attain the union of my soul with God, a union imperatively demanded by my reason as well as by the express will of my Creator. . . . This raises reason to secure supremacy over appetite, enlightens it with clear knowledge of its eternal destiny, and bestows a power of loving God and man altogether superhuman. . . . I have spoken simply as a Catholic, belonging to a religion in the highest possible sense rational, and which unites me to God in soul and body, and as a man of today looking always to the dictates of conscience for guidance and adherence to Christ." (*Why I Am what I Am*, p. 48 ff.)<sup>8)</sup> And in his *Symbolism* J. A. Moehler (Catholic) freely says: "In the Catholic system of doctrine two elements—the divine and the human, the natural and the supernatural, the mystical and the rational—move in uniform and harmonious combination." Some, the Antitrinitarians and others, followed a "one-sided rational principle"; they "gave to the rational principle a melancholy preponderance." The Catholic system preserves the right balance; it knows when to apply the mystical, divine, principle, and when to apply the rational principle. (P. 481 f. See also page XIX.) In Catholic theology reason has a voice, and since it is permitted to interpret Scripture, its voice speaks louder than Scripture. It is *sola ratio!*<sup>9)</sup>

8) How would a Bible Christian have expressed himself on this matter?

9) W. Walther: "Ebenso falsch urteilt der natuerliche Mensch und Rom ueber die natuerliche Vernunft. Das Goettliche soll ihr keineswegs zu hoch liegen; sie soll es nur nicht ganz erreichen koennen. . . . Wie dem suendigen Menschen die Willensfreiheit geblieben sein soll, so auch die Vernunft. Ihr blosses Licht soll 'den einen und wahren Gott, unsern Schoepfer und Herrn, sicher erkennen koennen. Einer Offenbarung bedarf es nur zur Erkenntnis der uebernatuerlichen, der mit der *gratia* zusammenhaengenden Wahrheiten. . . . Und demgemaess ist noch heute das katholische System eine Zusammensetzung aus natuerlichem und geoffenbartem Wissen." (*Lehrbuch der Symbolik*, pp. 62, 165.) — This is how a Unitarian writer sizes up the situation: "I am a Unitarian because its principles and its beliefs commend themselves to me as the most rational that I am able to conceive. I know that there are those who will imagine that I thus confess a fatal error at the start—the making of reason, and not revelation, the basis of my belief. But in doing this frankly and openly, I only do what others are obliged to do secretly and clandestinely. . . . However it may have been in past times, it is certain that in our own the Roman Catholic and orthodox Protestant alike endeavor to establish the reasonableness not only of their general claim but of the contents of their revelation of the Church or Book. Cardinal Manning says that, when doctrines are approved by reason, they cease to be doctrines of revelation and that the first step toward infidelity is



*Ratio inimica fidei!* Give reason a voice in theology, and you will lose the truth of revelation. It is either reason or revelation. See what happened to Rome! Obsessed by the pride of reason, it has lost the chief teaching of Scripture, salvation by grace, justification by faith. Cardinal Gibbons says that Catholic theology does not give up any revealed truths on account of rationalistic considerations. It has retained indeed some revealed truths. But it has sacrificed important truths and the one all-important truth on the altar of carnal pride and reason. Speaking of the theology of Rome, Luther said that "the Holy Scriptures and the Christian faith are little taught and the blind, heathen master Aristotle rules alone. . . . It grieves me to the heart that this damned, conceited, artful heathen has with his false words deluded, and made fools of, so many of the best Christians. God has sent him as a plague upon us for our sins." (X:335 f.)

TH. ENGELDER

(To be continued)

## Kleine Prophetenstudien

### Jona

#### 2

In dem vorangehenden Artikel über das Buch Jona sind schon einige Einwürfe gegen die Geschichtlichkeit des Buches und seiner Erzählungen und Angaben besehen worden. Aber nun kommen wir zu dem Hauptanstoß, den der Unglaube an dem Buche nimmt, nämlich die Aussage, daß Jona von einem Walfisch verschlungen worden sei, drei Tage und drei Nächte im Bauche des Walfisches verweilt, dort einen Psalm gebetet habe und dann wieder ausgespien worden sei. Dazu sagt der moderne Unglaube: Das ist unmöglich. Und auf alle mögliche Weise wird darüber gespottet und gelacht. Schon der alte Spötter und Christenfeind Lucian von Samosata (geboren 120 nach Christo) sagt in seiner *Vera Historia*, um die Sache lächerlich zu machen, daß er und seine Gefährten und ihr Schiff von einem 800 Stadien (100 Meilen) großen Fisch verschlungen worden und in dessen Bauche achtzehn Monate lebendig geblieben seien. Der Kirchenvater Augustinus klagt darüber, daß die Heiden sich über diese Geschichte unnütz machen, und redet von der *irrisio paganorum*. Der bekannte vulgäre rationalistische Exeget Hitzig sagte: „Die ganze Erzählung ist wunder- und märchenhaft; allein bei Gott ist kein Ding unmöglich. Also lebt Jona

to attempt to rationalize dogma. If this be so, then Cardinal Newman took many steps that way and did his best to deprive the doctrines of the Church of their character of revelation, because he did his best to win for them a reasonable appearance." (*Why I Am What I Am*, p. 86.)



im Bauch des Fisches, ohne zu ersticken; also sproßt über Nacht der kikajon (Kürbis, gourd) zu einer Höhe, daß er einen Sitzenden beschattet; das Los trifft gerade den Rechten; der Sturm, wie er sich zweckmäßig erhoben hat, legt sich auch zur geeigneten Zeit, und der Fisch ist bei der Hand, den Zona zu verschlingen und auch wieder auszuspeien; nicht minder so der Baum aufzusprossen, der Wurm, welcher ihn abtötet, und der Sturmwind, der seinen Verlust fühlbar macht.“<sup>1)</sup> Der seinerzeit bekannte ungläubige Prediger Schwalb in Bremen bemerkte einmal: „Daß man heutzutage die Wirklichkeit dieser Geschichte zu behaupten wagt, ist ein Wunder fast ebenso groß wie das Wunder selbst, und — leider — ist es nicht zu leugnen.“<sup>2)</sup> Und so könnten wir noch mehr Beispiele des Spottes aus alter und neuer Zeit beibringen, sowohl von Seiten der Gelehrten wie des ungläubigen Volkes. Wenn unsere jungen Leute gelegentlich mit andern jungen Leuten zusammenkommen, so wird gern gegen sie gerade diese Geschichte ausgespielt, und sie wird sogar in Sonntagschulen und Bibelklassen lächerlich gemacht, wofür wir auch Belege anführen könnten.

Demgegenüber steht das klare, bestimmte Zeugnis Christi, Matth. 12, 40: „Gleichwie Jonas war drei Tage und drei Nächte in des Walfisches Bauch, also wird des Menschen Sohn drei Tage und drei Nächte mitten in der Erde sein“ (vgl. Luf. 11, 29, 30; Matth. 16, 4). Und wir sagen mit vollem Glauben, nicht spöttisch, wie es Hitzig tut: „Bei Gott ist kein Ding unmöglich“, Luf. 1, 37; „So der Herr spricht, so geschieht's; so er gebietet, so siehe's da“, Ps. 33, 9. Man hat freilich auch Luther als Zeugen für die Unzuverlässigkeit des Buches in Anspruch genommen, der an einer Stelle sagt: „Diese Historie des Propheten Jonas ist so groß, daß sie schier unglaublich ist, ja lautet lügerlicher und ungereimter denn irgend der Poeten Fabeln eine; und wenn sie nicht in der Bibel stünde, so lacht' ich's wie einer Lügen.“ Und noch einmal: „Ich selbst gläubt's nicht, wenn's nicht in der Heiligen Schrift stünde.“<sup>3)</sup> Man übersieht dabei, daß beide Stellen in den Tischreden Luthers stehen, die bekanntlich nicht von Luther selbst aufgeschrieben sind, sondern von seinen Tischgenossen und Schülern und darum nicht in Anspruch genommen werden können als ipsissima verba Luthers; aber wir nehmen sie an, wie sie lauten, denn Luther stellt alles ins rechte Licht, wenn er hinzufügt „wenn sie nicht in der Bibel stünde“, „wenn's nicht in der Heiligen Schrift stünde“. Dazu kommt, daß Luther den Propheten Zona trefflich ausgelegt hat und in dieser Auslegung durchweg die volle Geschichtlichkeit und Glaubwürdigkeit des Buches annimmt und einmal zu Kap. 2, 1 ausruft: „Hilf, Gott, welch ein wunderlich Werk ist doch das! Wer kann es genugsam bedenken,

1) Zitiert von Reil, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, S. 337.

2) Zitiert im 45. Bericht des Michigan-Distrikts (1910), S. 37.

3) St. Louiser Ausgabe XXII, 1424. 1426.

daß ein Mensch soll drei Tage und Nächte so einsam, ohne Licht, ohne Speise, mitten im Meer, im Fische leben und wiederkommen? Das mag wohl eine seltsame Schifffahrt heißen. Wer wollte es auch glauben und nicht für eine Lüge und Märlein halten, wo es nicht in der Schrift stünde?“<sup>4)</sup>

Aber es muß auch im Auge behalten werden, daß, wenn man überhaupt Wunder annimmt, es verkehrt ist, eine Grenze ziehen und einen Unterschied machen zu wollen, welche Wunder glaubhaft seien und welche nicht. Wunder sind eben Dinge, die gegen — oder sagen wir lieber über — die Gesetze der Natur gehen. Wie darf sich dann der menschliche Verstand herausnehmen, festzustellen, wie weit ein Wunder die Naturgesetze durchbrechen darf, um noch glaubhaft zu sein? Das Wesen des Wunders besteht eben darin, daß es die Natur durchbricht, und auf ein Plus oder Minus kommt es dabei gar nicht an. „So der Herr spricht, so geschieht's; so er gebet, so stehet's da.“ Darum hat schon Augustinus ganz richtig zu seiner Zeit auf die Einwürfe gegen das Jonabuch gesagt: „*Ad hoc respondetur, quod aut omnia divina miracula credenda non sint aut hoc cur non credatur causa nulla est.*“ Und darum wird auch die geschichtliche Wahrheit dieses Vorfalls verteidigt nicht nur bei dem älteren Völkenthal, sondern auch in neuerer Zeit von Hävernid, Hengstenberg, Baumgarten, Nägelsbach, Keil, John Urquhart, Leander Keyser, Robert Dick Wilson und vielen bibelgläubigen Theologen, deren Namen nicht so bekannt sind wie diese.<sup>5)</sup>

Ohne daß wir jetzt auf alle damit verbundenen Fragen eingehen und das Wunderbare, das eben einfach Glauben fordert, näher erörtern können, wollen wir nur diesen einen Punkt etwas ausführlicher behandeln, der das Verschlungen und das AusSpeien des Fisches nach naturgeschichtlichen Angaben betrifft.

Zunächst ist oft die Frage aufgeworfen worden, was es denn für ein Fisch war, der den Jonas verschlungen habe. Manche nehmen an,

4) Über die verschiedenen Ausgaben der lateinisch gehaltenen und dann deutsch erschienenen Vorlesung Luthers über den Propheten Jona, die dann von drei verschiedenen Personen ins Lateinische übersetzt wurde, findet sich Näheres in der St. Louiser Ausgabe, XIV, 836. 912. 944. Die angeführte Stelle S. 873.

5) Völkenthal, Die gute Sache der göttlichen Offenbarung, V, 262—271; IX, 480—495. Urquhart, Die neueren Entdeckungen und die Bibel. Vom Verfasser autorisierte Übersetzung von E. Spliedt, V, 182—204. R. D. Wilson schließt seine trefflichen philologischen Untersuchungen über „The Authenticity of Jonah“ (Princeton Theological Review, 16, 280. 456) mit diesen Worten: „Those who assail it [the Book of Jonah] must confine themselves to its accounts of miracles, predictions, and divine interventions. At all such assaults the Christian will sniff, and He that sitteth in the heavens will laugh. For in these days of surgeon's wonders and submarines' achievements and Burbank's experiments it is a bold man who will attempt to set limits to the subtleties of the All-wise or to affix bounds to the almighty Maker and Preserver of all things. Christus Creator, Christus Revelator, Christus Consummator! Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven, or canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth?“ Job 38:33.“

daß Gott einen besonderen Fisch dafür geschaffen habe; aber diese Annahme ist nicht nötig und wird auch nicht durch den biblischen Text angedeutet. Die englische Bibel übersetzt zwar nicht ganz genau: "The Lord had prepared a great fish," während die deutsche Übersetzung richtiger sagt: „Der Herr verschaffte“ (nicht schuf) „einen großen Fisch“, Kap. 2, 1 (1, 17), was dem hebräischen Wort נִשְׁפָּח entspricht, „bestellen, bestimmen“. Aber was für ein Fisch es war, läßt sich wohl nicht näher feststellen und braucht auch nicht Kopfscherbrechen zu verursachen. Das Buch selbst sagt einfach „einen großen Fisch“, הִישֵׁךְ נָח, und im Neuen Testamente wird dies mit κητος wiedergegeben, Matth. 12, 40, was einfach Seeungetüm, sea-monster, heißt. Ob es ein Walfisch war, der sogenannte sperm-whale, wie viele annehmen, oder ein Haifisch oder ein anderer großer Fisch, wird sich wohl nicht fest bestimmen lassen. Reil meint, es sei ein Haifisch gewesen, und bemerkt in seinem Kommentar (S. 284): „Der Haifisch . . . erreicht nach Cuvier (das Tierreich) bis zu 25 Fuß Länge, nach Oken (Allgemeine Naturgeschichte) 4 Klafter Länge“ (Klafter = 6 Fuß) „und hat in seinem Rachen etwa 400 lanzenförmige Zähne in 6 Reihen, welche das Tier aufrichten und legen kann, weil sie nur in Hautzellen stecken. Er ist häufig im Mittelländischen Meere, wo er sich meistens in der Tiefe aufhält, ist äußerst gefräßig, verschlingt alles, was ihm vorkommt, Robben, Schollen und Tunfische, mit denen er manchmal an Sardinien in die Netze gerät und gefangen wird. Man hat daselbst in einem 3—4 Zentner schweren gegen ein Duzend unversehrter Tunfische gefunden, ja in einem sogar ein ganzes Pferd.“ Auf einer der Weltausstellungen der letzten Jahre, wo auch Walfische ausgestellt waren, sagte mir ein Walfischfänger, daß es 63 verschiedene Spezies dieser Tiere gebe, mit welchem Recht oder Unrecht, kann ich nicht bestimmen. Aber daß es Fische gibt, die eine Größe erreichen, daß sie leicht einen Menschen verschlingen können, sollte heutzutage niemand mehr leugnen. Bei Miami, Florida, wurde vor etwa 30 Jahren ein riesiger Fisch gefangen, 15 Tonnen schwer, 45 Fuß lang, der einen andern Fisch, der 1,500 Pfund wog, verschluckt hatte. Es dauerte 39 Stunden, ehe er gefangen wurde, und es wurde ein Bild von ihm angefertigt, das zeigte, wie ein Mann in seinem Rachen stehen konnte. Ich habe Personen getroffen, die diesen Fisch, der dann präpariert und eine Zeit lang aufbewahrt wurde, gesehen haben. Der obengenannte Naturforscher Cuvier bestätigt, daß ein Mensch in einem Fischbauch längere Zeit leben könne, namentlich im Schlaf oder Starrkrampf.<sup>6)</sup> Die oben erwähnten Apologeten und andere bringen genug Belege dafür bei, und ich habe eine Anzahl von Mitteilungen über Vorkommnisse in älterer und neuerer Zeit darüber gesammelt, möchte aber namentlich auf einen Artikel, der leicht zugänglich ist, verweisen. Der englische Theolog Ambrose John Wilson vom

6) Mitgeteilt bei Rupprecht, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, S. 265.

Queen's College, Oxford, hat einen längeren Artikel über diese Sache veröffentlicht, "The Sign of the Prophet Jona and Its Modern Confirmations,"<sup>7)</sup> in dem er viele Zeugnisse aus lauter wissenschaftlichen Veröffentlichungen mitteilt und dem folgende Angaben entnommen sind: "The great fish would be the sperm-whale, or cachalot, the species which inhabits the Southern waters where Jonah was voyaging, being met with . . . in all tropical and subtropical seas (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, art. 'Whale'), and in summer occasionally visiting the Shetlands and even Iceland (E. G. Boulenger, 'Queer Fish,' p. 83). It 'attains a very large size and may measure from 50 to 70 or 80 feet in length.' 'The head is about one third of the length of the body, very massive, high and truncated in front' (*Popular Encyclopedia*, art. 'Oesophagus'; and *Encyclopedia Britannica*, art. 'Sperm-whale')." Wir können also wohl ganz gut annehmen, daß der Fisch, der den Jona verschlungen hat, 60 Fuß lang war (das sind 9 Fuß weniger als das Modell im South Kensington Museum in London) und sein Maul 20 Fuß lang, 15 Fuß hoch und 9 Fuß breit (A Lecture on the Psychology of Animals Swallowed Alive, by Sir John Bland Sutton, President, Royal College of Surgeons). Wilson bringt auch den Nachweis "that the whale's esophagus, or gullet, is not too small", und teilt aus den *Kensington Museum Records*, "Guide to Whales", mit: The sperm-whale subsists for the most part on the octopus, "the bodies of which, far larger than the body of a man, have been found whole in its stomach." Wilson bemerkt ferner: "The sperm-whale has constant reason to develop a distended esophagus. It swims about with its lower jaw hanging down and its huge gullet gaping like some submarine cavern." (Frank T. Bullen, *Cruise of the Cachalot*, pp. 221, 342.) Aus einem Werke von Sir Francis Fox, *Sixty-three Years of Engineering*, p. 295, teilt Wilson mit: "The skeleton of a shark 16 feet long" was "found in a whale." Er wirft dann die Frage auf: "Could a man live in a whale?" und antwortet: "He certainly could, though in circumstances of very great discomfort. There would be air to breathe—of a sort. This is necessary to enable the fish to float. The heat would be very oppressive, 104–106 degrees Fahrenheit. . . . The gastric juice would be extremely unpleasant, but not deadly. It cannot digest living matter." Er zitiert aus dem eben angeführten Werke von Boulenger, *Queer Fish*, p. 185: "When dying the cachalot always ejects the contents of his stomach," sagt dann noch: "There are many cases where whales in the fury of their dying agony have swallowed human beings," bringt dafür Beispiele bei und bemerkt schließlich: "This is the regular method by which the sperm-whale is accustomed constantly to

7) *Princeton Theological Review*, 25 (1927), 630. 642.

rid itself of awkward and indigestible objects that it has swallowed." Wilson bezieht sich auch auf das Vorkommnis mit dem Walfischfänger James Bartley im Jahre 1891, das Sir Francis Fox in seinem schon genannten Werke *Sixty-three Years of Engineering* erwähnt und das wiederholt in Zeitschriften und Büchern mitgeteilt worden ist. Dieser Walfischfänger wurde, als seine Schiffsgenossen einen Walfisch harpuniert hatten, bei den Anstrengungen des zum Tode verwundeten Tieres durch das Tau in den Ozean gerissen, vom Walfisch verschlungen, und als dann seine Genossen ganz heldenmähige Anstrengungen machten, den Walfisch aufs Deck zogen, der Zimmermann des Bootes mit der Axt den Kopf trennte und der Bauch aufgeschliffen wurde, lebendig im Walfisch gefunden. Davon sagt Wilson: "Let it be clearly understood that the whole story was carefully investigated, not only by Sir Francis Fox, but by two French scientists, one of whom was the late M. de Parville, the scientific editor of the *Journal des Debats* of Paris, 'one of the most careful and painstaking scientists in Europe,' who concluded his investigations by stating his belief that the account given by the captain and crew of the English whaler is worthy of belief. 'There are many cases where whales in the fury of their dying agony have swallowed human beings; but this is the first modern case in which the victim has come forth safe and sound.' After this modern illustration he says, 'I end by believing that Jonah really did come out from the whale alive, as the Bible records.'" Diese Zeugnisse mögen für diese Frage genügen. Sie ließen sich leicht vermehren.

Kehren wir nun zu dem sonstigen Inhalt des Buches Jona zurück. Es ist schon erwähnt worden, daß es nur die eine kurze Geschichte von der Sendung des Propheten nach Ninive mit den sie begleitenden historischen Umständen erzählt, aber so klar und übersichtlich, daß der Bibel-leser keine besondere Inhaltsangabe nötig hat. Die gewöhnliche Einteilung in vier Kapitel gibt am besten die Disposition des Buches an und eignet sich auch durchaus für die praktische Darbietung in Predigten und Bibelstunden. P. G. E. Hageman in Charlottesville, Va., hat vor einer Reihe von Jahren das Buch in acht Predigten behandelt, die auch im Drude erschienen sind.<sup>8)</sup>

Aber einige wichtige heilsgeschichtliche Punkte dürften etwas ausführlicher behandelt werden. Wir fragen zunächst: Was war denn nun die Heilsabsicht Gottes bei dieser Sendung des Propheten nach Ninive? Denn Gott hat immer und in allem als letztes Ziel das Heil der Menschen im Auge; Heil ist das Ende aller Wege Gottes, etwas genauer ausgedrückt, das Heil, das in dem Messias kommt und in der Kirche

8) *The Prophet Jonah: His Remarkable Flight; His Remarkable Discovery; His Remarkable Punishment; His Remarkable Rescue; His Remarkable Prayer; His Remarkable Sermon; His Remarkable Success; His Remarkable Failure.*

zu finden ist. Es war ein bekannter Lehrsatz der alten jüdischen Synagoge, der nun auch durch das Buch Jona bestätigt wird: „Das Endziel aller Weissagungen der Propheten sind die Tage des Messias.“<sup>9)</sup> Auch die Juden der späteren Zeit haben eben viel Wahres und Nichtiges erkannt und hatten oft ein besseres Verständnis des Alten Testaments als neuere christliche Ausleger, die doch zu dem Alten Testament auch das Neue Testament, das klarere Buch der Erfüllung, haben. Wir können Gottes Absicht wohl erkennen. Diese Sendung des Propheten nach Ninive ist ein Beweis gegen den Partikularismus, den man so gern der alttestamentlichen Ökonomie, dem alttestamentlichen Heilsplan Gottes beimißt und in dem auch das jüdische Volk mehr oder weniger verstrickt war, daß nämlich Gott nur der Juden Gott und nicht auch der Heiden Gott sei, während doch Gott auch den Heiden Barmherzigkeit und Heil wiederfahren lassen will, wenn sie Buße tun. Gerade in den Weissagungen des Alten Testaments zeigt sich Gott als der Gott aller Völker, von dem Wort vom Weibessamen und vom Abrahamsamen an, durch den alle Geschlechter auf Erden gesegnet werden sollen, 1 Mos. 3, 15; 12, 3; und es ist ganz auffallend, wenn man genauer darauf achtet, daß besondere Offenbarungen dieses göttlichen Universalismus häufig zusammenhängen mit besonderen Strafgerichten über Gottes Eigentumsvolk Israel. Daß dies wirklich ein leitender Gedanke unsers merkwürdigen Buches ist, ergibt sich aus den Worten, mit denen der König von Ninive seinen Befehl an die Einwohner, daß sie Buße tun sollten, schließt: „Wer weiß, Gott möchte sich lehnen und ihn reuen und sich wenden von seinem grimmigen Zorn, daß wir nicht verderben“, Kap. 3, 9. Und darauf folgt dann B. 10: „Da aber Gott sah ihre Werke, daß sie sich bekehrten von ihrem bösen Wege, reuete ihn des Übels, das er geredet hatte, ihnen zu tun, und tat's nicht.“ Ebenso finden wir diese gnädige Gesinnung Gottes auch in den merkwürdigen Schlußworten des ganzen Buches, wo der Herr den Jona fragt: „Meinst du, daß du billig zürnest um den Kürbis?“ Und als Jona antwortet: „Billig zürne ich bis an den Tod“, hält ihm Gott vor: „Dich jammert des Kürbis, daran du nicht gearbeitet hast, hast ihn auch nicht aufgezogen, welcher in einer Nacht ward und in einer Nacht verdarb; und mich sollte nicht jammern Ninive, solcher großen Stadt, in welcher sind mehr denn hundertundzwanzigtausend Menschen, die nicht wissen Unterschied, was rechts oder links ist, dazu auch viel Tiere?“ Kap. 4, 9—11. Gerade dieser Gesichtspunkt erklärt auch diesen, wie man wohl sagen kann, ganz auffälligen, abrupten Schluß des Buches. Es schließt mit einer Frage. Wir würden einen andern Schluß erwarten; aber wenn wir die ganze Situation bedenken, paßt gerade dieser kurzabgebrochene Schluß ganz ausgezeichnet. Jona hat lange gegen Gott argumentiert,

<sup>9)</sup> Zitiert von Delitzsch in „Zeitschrift für die gesamte lutherische Theologie und Kirche“, herausgegeben von D. A. G. Rudelbach und D. G. E. F. Guericke. I, 2, 122.



aber schließlich ist er überwunden. Er weiß nichts mehr zu sagen, er verstummt. Wunderbare Weisheit Gottes, wunderbare Gestaltung der Heiligen Schrift! Es ist ähnlich wie in dem andern so merkwürdigen Buche, Hiob, mit seiner Frage: Warum wird der Fromme von Gott mit Leiden heimgesucht. Hiob selbst kann es nicht verstehen, daß er so leiden muß. Seine drei Freunde und sein eigenes Weib geben falsche, verkehrte Antwort und behaupten, Hiob werde um seiner Sünden willen gestraft. Elihu, der jüngere Mann, bringt das Problem des Leidens der Lösung schon etwas näher; aber endlich erscheint Gott selbst im Wetter und löst dem Hiob alle seine Fragen und Bedenken, alle seine Skrupel und Argumente, und Hiob kann dann auch nichts weiter sagen als demütig bekennen: „Ich erkenne, daß du alles vermagst, und kein Gedanke ist dir verborgen. Es ist ein unbesonnener Mann, der seinen Rat meinet zu verbergen. Darum bekenne ich, daß ich habe unweislich geredet, das mir zu hoch ist und nicht verstehe.“ Jehovaß versährt mit Jona, wie er mit Hiob verfahren ist, und bringt ihn zur Erkenntnis. Er hat dem Hiob allerlei Fragen vorgelegt über die Wunder der Natur und die Führungen Gottes im Menschenleben und zu ihm gesagt: „Ich will dich fragen“ (du kluger kleiner Mensch), „lehre mich“, Kap. 40, 2; aber Hiob antwortet dann demütig, bescheiden, zurechtgebracht, und spricht zu Gott: „Ich will dich fragen, lehre mich“, Kap. 42, 2—4.

Aus dem, was eben über den Partikularismus der Juden und den Universalismus Gottes gesagt worden ist, erklärt sich wohl auch, warum Jona zuerst vor Gott flieht und durch die bitteren Erfahrungen auf dem Meer zurechtgebracht werden muß. Er steckt eben als Jude auch in diesem Partikularismus. Er denkt: „Israel ist Gottes Volk; die Heiden sind verdammt.“ Er hat, wie Luther des weiteren in treffender Weise ausführt, „noch eine jüdische, fleischliche Meinung von Gott gehabt, als sei Gott allein der Juden Gott und nicht der Heiden, . . . hat gedacht, die Niniviten wären Gottes Wort und Gnaden nicht wert, weil sie nicht Gottes Volk, das ist, Juden oder unter dem israelitischen Volk wären.“<sup>10)</sup> Er fürchtet sich wohl auch, wie schon Luther hervorhebt, vor der unmöglich erscheinenden Aufgabe, daß er in die große, stolze, gottlose heidnische Stadt gehen und dort Buße predigen soll; und dazu kam vielleicht schließlich auch Menschenfurcht, die Besorgnis, wie es ihm wohl bei der Predigt in Ninive ergehen würde. Aber dies alles sind gerade so getreue, psychologische Züge, daß auch dadurch die Geschichtlichkeit des ganzen Buches gewaltig bestätigt wird. Eine alte Überlieferung, wieder der jüdischen Synagoge (Mekilta), sagt ganz sinnig: „Es war dem Propheten mehr an der Ehre des Kindes als an der Ehre des Vaters; mehr an der Ehre des Volkes Gottes als an der Ehre Gottes selber.“ Und wenn wir ins

10) XIV, 854. Wer etwa einmal über Jona predigen möchte, sollte ja diese ganz treffliche Auslegung Luthers benutzen, die auch in einem bequemen kleinen Separatdruck zu haben ist. Vgl. „Lutheraner“ von 1940, Nr. 10, S. 174.



Neue Testament blicken, dann finden wir solche Gedanken sogar noch nach der Erteilung des großen Missionsbefehls, der Himmelfahrt Christi und der Ausgiehung des Heiligen Geistes bei dem Apostel Petrus. Wie Jona dem göttlichen Ruf entfliehen will, um nicht einem unbeschnittenen Volk das Wort Gottes predigen zu müssen, so will Petrus in Zoppe lieber Gott widersprechen als das aufgehobene jüdische Zeremonialgesetz übertreten, wenn er Apost. 10, 14 bei dem Gesicht von den unreinen Tieren, die er schlachten und essen soll, zu Gott sagt: „O nein, Herr; denn ich habe noch nie etwas Gemeines oder Unreines gegessen.“

Aber, könnte man sagen, was ist das für ein Prophet Gottes? Er tut nicht, was Gott ihm befiehlt, sondern läuft davon; und wenn er es schließlich doch unternimmt, in Ninive predigt und die Stadt mit dem König an der Spitze Buße tut, dann ist er unzufrieden, daß Gott die Stadt nicht zerstört, murtelt wider Gott, und will lieber tot sein als leben. Wie kann ein Prophet, ein Bote Gottes, so reden und handeln? Dies hat wiederum schon unsere alten Ausleger beschäftigt, und sie haben darauf ganz treffend geantwortet. Matthew Henry bemerkt in seinem Kommentar in bezug auf diese Situation: „In the first chapter we had Jonah fleeing from the face of God. Here (in chapter 4) we have him, in effect, flying in the face of God.“ Und Luther sagt in seiner charakteristischen Weise: „Das ist mir je fürwahr ein wunderlicher, seltsamer Heiliger, der da zürnt, daß Gott den Sündern gnädig ist, und gönnt ihnen kein Gutes, sondern eitel Unglück.“<sup>11)</sup> Aber gerade die ganze Geschichte unsers Buches, die oft so oberflächlich gelesen und behandelt wird, daß B. F. Ellis, der bekannte Sonntagsschulliterat, sagen kann: „One of the tragedies of literature is that most persons know nothing about the Book of Jonah except the whale“, legt wieder Zeugnis ab für die Echtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit des Buches als von Jona selbst geschrieben. Mit Recht sagt Delitzsch: „Mir scheint das Buch Jona als ein unter tiefer Beschämung und göttlicher Selbstverleugnung auf Trieb des Heiligen Geistes niedergeschriebenes Sündenbekenntnis des zurechtgebrachten Propheten, welches den prophetischen Schriften deshalb einverleibt ist, weil Jona, weisend selbst da, als er nicht weisagen wollte, ein Typus des zukünftigen Christus war, in dem allein und durch den allein den Gläubigen auch des alttestamentlichen Dion (Kap. 3, 5: „Da glaubten die Leute zu Ninive“) Gnade zuteil wurde.“<sup>12)</sup> Und der seinerzeit bekannte Prof. Wilhelm Schmidt, Mitglied der Synode und Professor an deren praktischem Seminar in St. Paul, hat mir einmal erzählt, daß D. Loy, der oftgenannte theologische Professor am Seminar der Synode in Columbus und allgemeine Präses seiner Synode, in einer Pastoralpredigt gesagt habe: Der Rauch des Balfisches war für Jona ein praktisches Seminar, und in diesem praktischen Seminar hat Jona in drei Tagen

11) XIV, 896.

12) Rudelbach-Guerides Zeitschrift, I, 2, 122.

mehr wahre Pastoraltheologie gelernt, als mancher theologische Student in seinen drei Seminarjahren heimmimmt.

Aber warum steht dann dieses Buch, wenn es wirklich Geschichte enthält, wie ausführlich nachgewiesen worden ist, unter den Propheten und nicht unter den Geschichtsbüchern? Und wenn es wegen seines kleinen Umfangs nicht neben die großen Geschichtsbücher Josua, Samuels und Könige gestellt werden sollte, da es nur eine Episode behandelt, warum steht es dann nicht neben dem kleinen historischen Buche Ruth in dem dritten Teil des hebräischen Alten Testaments, unter den sogenannten Hagiographen? Auch diese Frage läßt sich wohl beantworten. Das Buch hat mit gutem Grunde seine Stelle unter den Propheten, da Jona im strengen Sinne des Wortes ein Prophet war und seine Geschichte wirklich tiefe prophetische, typische Bedeutung hat, die uns im Lichte des Neuen Testaments ganz klar entgegenstrahlt. Das Verweilen des Jona im Bauche des Fisches drei Tage und drei Nächte schattete ab und wies hin auf Christi Begräbnis und Verweilen im Schoße der Erde. Nach Matth. 12, 38—40 antworteten etliche unter den Schriftgelehrten und Pharisäern und sprachen zu Jesu: „Meister, wir wollten gerne ein Zeichen von dir sehen.“ Und er antwortete und sprach zu ihnen: „Die böse und ehebrecherische Art sucht ein Zeichen; und es wird ihr kein Zeichen gegeben werden denn das Zeichen des Propheten Jonas. Denn gleichwie Jonas war drei Tage und drei Nächte in des Walfisches Bauch, also wird des Menschen Sohn drei Tage und drei Nächte mitten in der Erde sein.“ Wieviel die Juden zur Zeit Jonas davon verstanden haben, läßt sich nicht sagen. Wir können nicht künstlich den Schleier und die Decke hervorholen, die vor der Zeit der Erfüllung über der Weissagung lag, ähnlich wie wir auch z. B. sagen müssen, daß das volle Verständnis der Weissagung Sacharjas von dem Verkauf des Hirten um dreißig Silberlinge und dem Anlauf des Töfersaders, Kap. 11, 12, 13, erst dann aufgegangen ist, als sie buchstäblich erfüllt wurde. Aber wir können ganz gewiß auch annehmen, daß die Propheten, von dem Geiste Gottes erleuchtet, schwierige, dunkle Sachen ihrem Volke erläutert und erklärt haben. Das liegt schon in der Natur der Sache, das wissen wir aber auch von einzelnen Propheten ausdrücklich, wie z. B. von Hesekiel, zu dem die Ältesten des jüdischen Volkes kamen und sich in seinem Hause vor ihm niedersetzten, jedenfalls um Auskunft und Belehrung zu erhalten über das, was der Herr ihm offenbarte, Kap. 8, 1; 14, 1; 20, 1. 3; 24, 19. Gerade der Ausdruck, den der Heiland gebraucht, und wiederholt gebraucht, „das Zeichen des Propheten Jonas“ (vgl. auch Matth. 16, 4; Luk. 11, 29. 30), ist, wie schon früher bemerkt worden ist, zugleich dunkel und doch auch verständlich. Es ist ein Zeichen, das Glauben an Christum fordert und an die Spitze seines ganzen Erlösungswerkes, seine Auferstehung. Und wenn man fragen wollte, warum Jesus auf dieses Zeichen des Jona an den angeführten Stellen als auf ein letztes und drohendes Zeichen

hintweist, so hat darauf Baumgarten in einer Abhandlung „über das Zeichen des Propheten Jonas“ treffend geantwortet: „Viele Zeichen waren vorhergegangen, aber des Menschen Sohn hatte in Israel keinen Glauben gefunden; darum bleibt nur noch das Zeichen des Jonas übrig; dieses aber ist das Zeichen, daß das Evangelium den Juden genommen wird und zu den Heiden, welche seine Frucht bringen werden, übergeht. Matth. 21, 43.“<sup>13)</sup>

Und ähnlich steht es mit dem Bericht von der Buße Ninives. Gerade diese uns fast unglaublich erscheinende Geschichte ist durch das Zeugnis des allwissenden Gottessohnes, unsers Heilandes Jesu Christi, bestätigt, wenn er sagt: „Die Leute von Ninive werden auftreten am jüngsten Gerichte mit diesem Geschlechte und werden es verdammen; denn sie taten Buße nach der Predigt Jonas“. Und siehe, hier ist mehr denn Jonas“, Matth. 12, 41. Vgl. auch Luk. 11, 32. Darum sagte Delitsch mit Recht zu diesem Punkte der geschichtlichen Wahrheit des Jonabuchs: „über alles steht der lutherischen Kirche das Zeugnis des untrüglichen Oberhauptes der Kirche, Jesu Christi, von dem alle Akkommodation an den Irrtum und die Lüge so fern ist als das Licht von der Finsternis.“<sup>14)</sup> Und in einer den Verfasser nicht nennenden Abhandlung über „Die Idee des Buches Jona“ heißt es ganz treffend, daß dieses Buch, wenn recht verstanden, „eins der tiefstinnigsten des Alten Testaments ist und unter allen prophetischen Büchern des Alten Testaments sozusagen das neutestamentlichste“.<sup>15)</sup> Denn hier beginnt ausnahmsweise und dem Anfang nach das, was im Neuen Testament sich erfüllt hat und immer noch in Erfüllung begriffen ist, die Bekehrung der Heiden; und diese Bekehrung der Heiden geht fort, bis die aus Juden und Heiden gesammelte Kirche vollendet ist, bis die Vollzahl der Auserwählten in die Kirche des Neuen Testaments eingegangen ist und der Herr wiederkommt in großer Kraft und Herrlichkeit. Dies ist schon im jüdischen Talmud erkannt worden, und wir wiederholen die treffende Bemerkung von Profsch: „Mit Jona beginnt die erfolgreiche Heidenpredigt; der Menschensohn ruft auch die Heidenwelt zur Buße. Das Wort Gottes löst sich aus seiner nationalen Beschränkung; es wird frei zur univeralen Wirksamkeit.“<sup>16)</sup> Und es ist kein zutreffendes Argument dagegen, daß ja die Niniviten nicht beständig geblieben sind, daß die Kirche damals in Ninive noch keine blei-

13) Rubelbach-Guerides Zeitschrift, II, 2, 13.

14) Rubelbach-Guerides Zeitschrift, I, 2, 126. Delitsch bezieht sich damit auf die berüchtigte Akkommodationstheorie, daß Jesus, wenn er auch das von dem Verschlungenwerden des Jona durch einen Fisch und von der Buße der Niniviten Gesagte besser gewußt habe, sich doch in seiner Rede zu der damals landläufigen und bei den Juden allgemein geltenden, wenngleich irrigen, Annahme herabgelassen und sich an sie akkommodiert habe.

15) „Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche.“ Herausgegeben von Harleß, Höfling, Thomaeus, Hofmann. 21 (1851) 106.

16) „Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung“, 70 (1937), S. 225.

bende Stätte bekam und behielt. Dies ist freilich richtig. Ninive ist, wie schon im Juniheft dieser Zeitschrift ausgeführt worden ist, wieder zurückgesunken in sein gottloses, heidnisches Wesen, wie spätere Stellen, z. B. Jes. 10 und 37 und 2 Kön. 19, zeigen, hat das Reich Israel zu Hiskias Zeiten zerstört und das Reich Juda mit Krieg überzogen, weshalb ihm das Verderben und der endliche Ruin und Untergang angekündigt wird. Vgl. Nah. 2 und 3 und Zeph. 2, 13—15. Die Zeit des Neuen Testaments war eben damals noch nicht gekommen, die Zeit, in der die Heiden in Scharen eingehen sollten in die Kirche des Neuen Testaments und da ihre bleibende Wohnung finden, wie Jesaja und Micha voraussagen: „Es wird zur letzten Zeit der Berg, da des Herrn Haus ist, gewiß sein, höher denn alle Berge und über alle Hügel erhaben werden; und werden alle Heiden dazu laufen und viel Völker hingehen und sagen: Kommt, laßt uns auf den Berg des Herrn gehen, zum Hause des Gottes Jakobs, daß er uns lehre seine Wege und wir wandeln auf seinen Steigen. Denn von Zion wird das Gesetz ausgehen und des Herrn Wort von Jerusalem“, Jes. 2, 2, 3; Micha 4, 1, 2.

Schön bemerkt darum Hesselberg in einer ganz anspruchslos geschriebenen und wenig bekannten Auslegung: „In ihm“ (dem Buch Zona) „leuchtet ein himmlischer Strahl der ewigen Milde und Erbarmung Gottes über ein Volk, das in Todes Schatten saß, ein Spiegel für das Volk Gottes, damit es erkenne, daß nur Buße vom Zorne Gottes errettet.“<sup>17)</sup>

Dies sind einige heilsgeschichtliche Gedanken aus dem kleinen viel verspotteten, aber in Wahrheit ganz herrlichen Buche Zona. Wir gedenken, nun noch eine kurzgefaßte Auslegung des Gebetes Zona darzubieten.

2. Fürbringer

## Why Preach?

Preaching, if it is to serve its divine purpose, must have a very definite objective. This the preacher should not only know, but of this he should be conscious. What is the objective? Why preach?

### I

The purpose of all Christian preaching—at all times, at any place, before any audience—is the salvation of sinners and the glory of God. The Lord says: “Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel,” the good news of salvation, “to every creature,” Mark 16:15. “Ye shall be witnesses unto Me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria and unto the uttermost part of the earth,” Acts 1:8. Of his own preaching Paul said: “I deter-

17) Zitiert von Delitzsch in Rudelsbach-Guerides Zeitschrift, I, 2, 120.

mined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified," 1 Cor. 2:2. "We preach not ourselves," says Paul, "but Christ Jesus, the Lord," 2 Cor. 4:5. "We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, Be ye reconciled to God," 2 Cor. 5:20. And since God is our Creator, our Redeemer, and our Sanctifier, all glory belongs to Him and should be given to Him. "To Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen," Rev. 1:6.

## II

But while the salvation of the sinner and the glory of God is the *final* objective of all Christian preaching, that is, of the spoken Word, the written Word has the same purpose. All that the Christian preacher preaches he takes from the Bible, the written Word; he has no other source. "We speak wisdom . . . ; yet not the wisdom of this world nor of the princes of this world, that come to naught; but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery," 1 Cor. 2:6, 7. "Preach the Word"—thus Paul admonishes Timothy and all Christian preachers, 2 Tim. 4:2. But why should the Word be preached? Why does it not suffice that men have the written Word? The written Word works faith and sustains it, puts the love of Christ into the hearts of men, strengthens Christians to resist sin and lead a godly life, takes them from earth to heaven. The Word that is *preached* can do no more; it is the same Word. The preacher can add nothing to it, can give it no additional power. Why, then, did God give us "the ministry of reconciliation," "ambassadors for Christ," 2 Cor. 5:18, 20; "apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers," Eph. 4:11; "elders in every church," Acts 14:23; "elders in every city," Titus 1:5; "overseers to feed the church of God," Acts 20:28; "bishops apt to teach," 1 Tim. 3:2?

Many will not read the Word; they perhaps do not even have it. To these it must be preached. To such people we send our missionary preachers, in home and in foreign fields.

Many who do read the Word do not understand it. That is no fault of the Word. It speaks a simple and clear language. Even though Christ spoke clearly to His disciples, saying: "He shall be delivered unto the Gentiles and shall be mocked and spitefully entreated and spitted on, and they shall scourge Him and put Him to death, and the third day He shall rise again,"—clearly spoken,—yet we read: "And they understood none of these things; and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken," Luke 18:32-34. Even after His resurrection Jesus "opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures," Luke 24:45. The disciples had the preconceived wrong idea of a temporal kingdom which Christ would establish.

They asked: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom unto Israel?" Acts 1:6. In like manner many today come to the Bible with preconceived wrong ideas, which have become so fixed in their mind that they are thereby kept from understanding the plain language of Scripture. They need a Philip to say unto them: "Understandest thou what thou readest?" Acts 8:30, and to give them the true understanding. Such people need preachers to open the Scriptures unto them.

But our church-members have been instructed in the Word (parochial school, Sunday-school, catechumen class); they also have their Bible at home. Why preach to them? They should advance in Christian knowledge. They are not to remain babes, who must be fed on milk, but should arrive at that full age to which belongeth strong meat, Heb. 5:12-14. They should not remain "children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive," Eph. 4:14, 15, but should grow up to be men in understanding, "who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil," Heb. 5:14. Much of this could and would be accomplished if all our Christians would regularly, prayerfully, and carefully read and study their Bible. But do they?

Shall the preacher then be satisfied if he can say that he preaches the Word of God, that his sermons are orthodox, that he is presenting the doctrines of the Bible? If that is all, and if a sermon it must be, then church-members could be directed to read a sermon at home from one of the many sermon-books which we could recommend. We could also add a good commentary. *But the preacher must do more. He should preach the Word as the particular spiritual needs of his church-members demand it. That is why God gives preachers to Christian congregations.* They are to be *watchmen*, who hear the Word at God's mouth and give warning unto men, Ezek. 3:17-21; they are to *watch over the souls of men*, as they that must give account, Heb. 13:17; they are to be *pastors, shepherds*, who give heed to all the flock, protecting them against grievous wolves; they are to be *overseers*, who feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood, Acts 20:28, 29; they are by their teaching to advance their hearers not only in spiritual knowledge, Heb. 5:12 to 6:3, but in *grace*, 2 Pet. 3:18, in *faith*, Matt. 15:21-28; 17:20; 6:30, and in *good works*, Matt. 5:14-16; John 15:8; 1 Tim. 6:17-19; Gal. 5:16-26; Matt. 25:31-46. Not only instruction but instruction for the purpose of *edification*, as this is demanded by the particular needs of the people, that is the real purpose of preaching to a Christian congregation. By such preaching also the strangers who may be found in the church audience will be served.



## III

In the 14th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul speaks of preaching to the Christian congregation; its purpose, he says is *edification*. "He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to *edification*," v. 3; "he that prophesieth, *edifieth* the church," v. 4; "that the church may receive *edifying*," v. 5; "forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the *edifying* of the church," v. 12; "*when ye come together*, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto *edifying*," v. 26. If any one cannot speak for the *edification* of the church, "let him," says the apostle, "keep silence in the church," v. 28. In the church, the apostle says, he would rather speak five words that can be understood, so that the hearers will be *edified*, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue, which are not understood and therefore *edify* no one, v. 19.

In his Letter to the Ephesians, chapter 4, the apostle writes: "He," the ascended Lord, "gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the *edifying* of the body of Christ," vv. 11, 12. Of his and the other apostles' authority as preachers Paul says: "which the Lord hath given me to *edification*," 2 Cor. 13:10. When the persecution in the days of Paul had somewhat subsided, we read: "Then had all the churches rest throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria and were *edified*," Acts 9:31. That the blessings of the kingdom of God are given for the *edification* of its members we learn also from Rom. 14: "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God and approved of men. Let us therefore, follow after the things which make for peace and things wherewith one may *edify* another," vv. 17-19.

Wherever in the texts just quoted the word "*edification*" or "*edify*" occurs, the Greek either has the noun, *οικοδομή*, the act of building, building up, or, in New Testament metaphorical usage, "the act of one who promotes another's growth in Christian wisdom, piety, holiness, happiness" (Thayer); or it has the verb *οικοδομέω*, to build (up from the foundation), "to promote growth in Christian wisdom, affection, grace, virtue, holiness, blessedness" (Thayer). The word used in the English translation is of Latin origin, *aedificare*, having the same meaning as the Greek word, to *build*.

In the Christian congregation the *foundation* has been laid — Jesus Christ, 1 Cor. 3:11; "the foundation of the apostles and prophets" (not their person but their doctrine), "Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner-stone," Eph. 2:20. The members



of the congregation are Christians, having the right and only foundation for their faith and hope: *the Savior* as He comes to them in Word and Sacrament. Upon this foundation they are to be *built up*; and *preaching is to serve this purpose*. For this purpose the Christian preacher is to be a watchman, Ezek. 3:17; a shepherd, Jer. 23:4; an overseer, Acts 20:28; a nurse, 1 Thess. 2:7; a minister, 1 Tim. 4:6. Of course, he is to be all this in his entire relation to his congregation, but also in the pulpit he is to be preeminently a *Seelsorger*, ministering as such to all his people Sunday after Sunday and as often as he preaches. Preaching should supply the particular *spiritual* needs of the congregation, of a people who are Christians indeed but who still have the sinful flesh and live in a world in which they are surrounded by sinful people and exposed to the powers of darkness.

Preaching, therefore, of which no more can be said than that it is orthodox or Scriptural, but which does not supply the *particular spiritual needs of the Christian congregation* does not serve the real purpose of preaching. A preacher of such sermons is not that *Seelsorger* in the pulpit which he ought to be. To fill in a half hour, more or less, in the pulpit merely with an orthodox sermon does not in itself serve the real purpose of preaching. The *particular spiritual needs of the people entrusted to the care of a pastor* must be supplied. The Christian hearers should be edified, built up spiritually. The spiritual life of the Christian congregation should be deepened and enlarged, spiritually advanced. The Christians should by the Word of God be fortified against the false doctrines and the sins of their time. They should be encouraged to lead a Christian life. They should be comforted in their trials and tribulations. To this end the preacher should "preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine," 2 Tim. 4:2. Edification, with all that it implies — that is the concise Scriptural answer to the question, *Why preach?*

If the objective of preaching to a Christian congregation is to be reached, the preacher's heart must be filled with love to his Savior and to those souls for whom the Savior died, some of whom He has entrusted to the preacher's pastoral care, and for whom he must give account; the preacher must study the spiritual needs of his people; and he must give sufficient time to the careful preparation of his sermons.

Blessed is the preacher who in reference to the pastoral care of the flock which God has entrusted to him can say with Paul: "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have showed you and have taught you, publicly and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks repentance

toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . Wherefore I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God. . . . Therefore watch, and remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears. And now, brethren, I commend you to God and to the Word of His grace, which is able to *build you up* and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified," Acts 20:20, 21, 26, 27, 31, 32.

JOHN H. C. FRITZ

---

### Fallow Fields—the Church's Youth

---

The caption of this article is taken from a chapter in the very interesting and valuable book by Henry W. McLaughlin, entitled *Religious Education in the Rural Church*. The expression was used to designate and describe the condition of untold thousands of children, chiefly in the mountainous districts of the Southern Appalachians, who were growing up without a knowledge of God and of the Savior, until the Director of Country Church Work of the Presbyterian Church in the United States learned of their plight and organized a movement to bring them at least the fundamentals of religious education. The book shows that the remedy proposed was still very inadequate, chiefly because more emphasis seems to have been placed upon the amelioration of social conditions than on that of the children's personal relation to their Savior on the basis of His redeeming blood.

And yet this book, and others like it, is very stimulating; for many of the problems broached by the author may be transferred, without essential changes, to the field of work among the confirmed youth of our Church. One might begin with a series of true-false statements, such as:

A fallow field on a farm is one which is intensely cultivated.  
The Church has taken care of all the fallow fields in every part of its area.

Our Church has given public sanction to more intensive work among its young people.

The young people of our Church are overorganized.

The Church is providing adequately for all the needs of its young people.

All our congregations have established, and are maintaining, adequate contacts with all their young people.

The talents of our young people are being developed in such a manner as to make them efficient workers in the kingdom of our Lord.

It would be an interesting experience to have these statements discussed in pastoral conferences and to get the reaction of pastors

working under a variety of circumstances. For a study of the problem of the young people of our Church makes it clear that the attitude taken by many pastors and congregations vitiates their arguments for Christian parish-schools. For what are the chief arguments which we advance in favor of such schools, often referred to as the bulwark of confessional Lutheranism? They were enumerated in a previous article (May issue, p. 362 ff.); but may be briefly summarized here in order to have a starting-point for the present discussion.

It is clear from numerous passages of Holy Writ that the Lord places the chief obligation and responsibility for the rearing of children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord" upon the parents, Eph. 6:4. But since children, through Holy Baptism, are received as members of the Christian congregation, the latter also has a definite interest in the Christian training of its members as well as in their conduct in agreement with the Word of God. To this factor we must add that of the law of love, which makes it a duty of Christians to bear one another's burdens, also with regard to duties which are primarily given to parents. For since parents frequently are not properly trained to take charge of the full Christian rearing of their children or do not have the time which is required to bring them up to the standard set by the Word of God for adult membership in the Christian congregation, the latter, in its entire membership, should be ready to assume this duty. Moreover, since the standards which the Word of God sets with regard to adult membership in the Church, specifically with regard to admission to the Holy Eucharist, have so evidently best been reached in the Christian parish-school, therefore the congregation will naturally want to employ that agency which, for three generations in this country, has proved to be the most efficient institution for the adequate indoctrination of children for adult membership. All other agencies, even if added together and integrated as well as circumstances may permit, will rarely be able to produce the satisfactory and adequate results which have attended the work of the Christian parish-school if conducted with a proper regard to the development of all the capacities and abilities of the pupils entrusted to its guidance. And a final consideration, in the case of children who are not as yet baptized members of the congregation, is the obligation of the Great Commission, which bids all believers to make disciples of all nations by baptizing them and then teaching them to observe all things whatsoever the Lord of the Church has commanded us.

These, in substance, are our arguments for establishing and maintaining Christian parish-schools. While we do not therefore argue from the angle that any agency or institution for the Chris-

tian rearing of the young is commanded in the Word of God, we draw our conclusions from the precepts alluded to above, thus endeavoring to have all the members of our congregations realize the responsibility and obligation resting upon them and thereby inciting them to follow the law of love in having children prepared for the privileges and duties of adult membership in the congregation.

And now we repeat: Many pastors and congregations vitiate their arguments in behalf of Christian parish-schools by their attitude concerning the young people in their midst, specifically those of the postconfirmation age. If we feel that we have reasons based on Scriptural injunctions for the establishment and maintenance of Christian parish-schools and other agencies and institutions for training children in Christian knowledge and a God-fearing conduct, these same reasons must compel us, also as congregations, to give the proper attention to the children and young people after confirmation.

In the first place, the rite of confirmation does not absolve the parents of the duty and obligation of providing for the further instruction of their children in the Word of God and their continued training in the ways of true sanctification. By the same token, if our argument regarding the transfer of the obligation is correct, the congregation is bound to take a continued interest in the young members, who have indeed been admitted to the Sacrament but still require a tremendous amount of further instruction in order to come closer to the ideal of adult membership described, and even demanded, in Holy Writ. If some one should contend that attendance at church and the listening to sermons is sufficient for young people who have been confirmed, our reply is found in Heb. 5:12 to 6:2 and in passages presenting the same thought. A generation ago the institute of the *Christenlehre* was praised, and rightly so, as being an excellent medium for maintaining and developing a high standard of doctrinal understanding. Why, then, should objections be raised today against systematic Bible-study in young people's groups under the auspices of the congregation and of the called servant of the Word? A congregation cannot afford to be satisfied with the instruction of the catechumen class, though this is adequate for a proper appreciation and a worthy reception of the Lord's Supper. Bible classes for young people may not be an *absolute* necessity, but neither was the institute of the *Christenlehre*. And those who have conducted Bible classes for young people and have learned to appreciate the value of teaching on the level of the adolescent, with reference to the particular needs of the young people, will be ready to defend the thesis that more can be accomplished through this agency

than through the former agency, which tried to reach all the pupils, from the preconfirmation level to that of the adult of mature years. It may be true that there are teachers who can reach the individual in a class containing such a wide divergence in age and experience, but the number of teachers who are really successful in this endeavor is relatively small.

But there is still more to be said. One has but to page through some passages in St. Paul's letters, such as those addressed to the Corinthians, to realize that the Lord holds the congregation responsible for the conduct of its members. This fact is important in considering the obligation of the congregation to provide for the training of its young people in sanctification. We cannot well offer the excuse: If the young people are confirmed members of the church, they have had a course in the Ten Commandments and in the Third Article, not to speak of the "Table of Duties" and the "Christian Questions." Introspection and observation join in telling us that much of the teaching done in the preconfirmation age became memory information only and did not become practical, functional knowledge. The reason for this is obvious. Many configurations of life mean nothing to the child because his body and mind are not yet sufficiently developed to the point which would enable him to appreciate the application of knowledge (as, for example, in the case of most sins against the Sixth Commandment), while other items of information are associated with life situations of which the child knows only by hearsay. It is true that the Holy Ghost has a way of making much of the childhood knowledge functional at the proper time; but it is true, also, as we see from the teaching of the Bible, that we must continue to instruct young people in the postconfirmation age and, for that matter, all their lives, concerning the practical application of the precepts of God regarding a life of sanctification. If, as taught by the Lord in Matt. 18, we are to exercise watchfulness with regard to transgressions of God's Law, the situation offers the correlate that the congregation should provide training classes in the field of Christian ethics. Nor should this training be merely along the lines of prohibition and repression, for we are, in the great majority of cases, dealing with young Christians who take their relation to their God seriously. It should rather be in the nature of constructive assistance, such as will stimulate the young people to give positive evidence of their Christian discipleship. And once more we say: All the arguments which we employ in favor of establishing and maintaining Christian parish-schools have full validity also during the period of adolescence.

For that reason the social and recreational meetings of the young people should also be a matter of vital concern to pastors

and congregations, although not in the same degree as the program of teaching and training connected directly with the Word of God. Still the arguments which have commonly been employed with reference to the recreational program of a parish-school are bound to come to the front also in this instance. We have included instruction in physiology, hygiene, and sanitary science in the course of study of our parish-schools; we have provided playgrounds for our children, with the necessary apparatus for gymnastic exercises. Was this merely to ward off invidious comparisons with the State schools, that is, done in self-defense? Or were we conscious of the fact that the old Latin slogan *Mens sana in corpore sano* had some significance in the work of Christian schools also? Is it logical for us to take the position that after confirmation the social and recreational activities of the young people are no concern of the congregation and that its members should *a priori* take a negative stand when basketball courts and bowling-alleys are mentioned? It may be true that these appendages to our parish-houses have been overemphasized and that a disproportionate amount of money has been expended by some congregations in the erection of buildings devoted to recreational and social activities. But we ought to remember the Latin proverb *Abusus non tollit usum*. In other words, if there has been a false emphasis on such auxiliary activities, ways and means may be found to correct abuses. But we certainly need to be made conscious of the fact that substitution is a much better pedagogical measure than sublimation and repression, so long as we are moving in the field of *adiaphora*, and that prophylactic measures, judiciously applied, may save many a young person from being drawn into the commercialized recreation and into the commercialized vice of the world around us. It might be a valuable step forward if we, as leaders of the Church, would endeavor to take a more positive, constructive attitude in preference to the negative and forbidding demeanor which was, and is, all too frequently noticeable in dealing with the recreational and social program of our young people. After all, even these activities are to come under the heading of sanctification, as we learn from Col. 3:17 and 1 Cor. 10:31. Or shall we hide behind a wall of smugness and declare that we shall take care of the souls of our young people and let them see what they may find for themselves in the way of social contacts?

Also in this respect the children of this world are apparently wiser in their generation than the children of light. We have frequently had occasion, during the last fifteen years, to observe the work done by men and women who are working with the youth of our country, both in prophylactic endeavors and in constructive measures for building up a higher citizenship *morale*, and



it is a source of surprise and amazement to mark the progress which has been made. Granted that these workers are actuated largely by altruism and the hopes of civic betterment, we cannot but admire them for what they have accomplished. Remarkable work has been done in reducing crime and in building up the moral character of thousands of young people of the early and middle adolescent level. Shall these people, who for the most part are obliged to operate with inadequate motivation, put us to shame, who have the Word of God, not only as the infallible source of knowledge unto salvation but also as the one adequate criterion for the highest standards of conduct and life? If they feel the responsibility to provide guidance for adolescents and young people in general in order to procure better integration of their *protégés* in the body politic, how much more should we, with our better equipment in the matter of adequate incentive, after having laid the foundation of saving knowledge and working steadily on the superstructure, also provide guidance in the field of sanctification in order that our young people may become the light of the world, also by letting their light so shine before men that they may see their good works and glorify the Father which is in heaven?

All this means that an enormous responsibility is laid upon those who have been called into positions of leadership in the Church. The situation requires, first of all, that we continue to study the Word of God with unceasing vigor and tireless assiduity, not only to perfect ourselves more and more in handling the doctrinal content of the inspired record, but also in absorbing, and being saturated with, the truth of Holy Writ as it applies to every circumstance and condition of life. This is a challenge which will not be satisfied with less than a daily, systematic study of the Scriptures, in an endeavor to understand ever better the unsearchable riches of the grace of God in Christ Jesus, in the inexhaustible variety of configurations which the Bible offers.

But this study of the Word of God must be accompanied by efforts no less carefully planned to make constant progress in pedagogical equipment and in leadership abilities. It is a well-known fact, of course, that capacities, that is, innate powers, are not on the same level; for the Lord does not distribute even to all pastors and teachers the same measure of talents to be employed in instructing and training others. But this very fact lays upon every person who occupies a position of leadership the duty to develop the talents which he has received to their highest level of proficiency. The guiding principles for such training were laid down a few years ago in an article which developed the following propositions:

1. Leadership implies certain natural traits and attributes as well as a definite form of training.
2. There can be no true Christian leadership without intelligent and consecrated self-activity and constant mental and spiritual growth.
3. A program of leadership-training must include the transmission of a good working knowledge of the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, the distinctive doctrines of Lutheranism, the position of the Lutheran Church with reference to modern religious and moral philosophy, and the proper attitude of Lutheran Christians to the economic and social problems of the present age, including that of leisure time.
4. Leadership-training can be successfully carried out only by observing the rules of habit-formation: creation of interest; focalization of consciousness and attention; habituation by attentive repetition.
5. The correlate of leadership-training is an adequate training for intelligent and consecrated followership.
6. The objectives here indicated demand the regular dispensation of adequate information to all organizations concerned, preferably in analysis form, to be supplemented with special courses for such as show leadership possibilities on the psychology of leadership, personality and power, the manner of conducting meetings, reflective thinking, etc.
7. The methods used in leadership-training should be chiefly functional, those intended for the membership at large chiefly informational, but with functional elements. (See *Concordia Theological Monthly*, VI, 739—746; *Walther League Manual*, 178—186.)

Much might be said by way of expanding the material offered in the article that discusses the seven propositions, but the available space will not permit more than a brief summary. Yet the following points should receive the earnest consideration of every person who occupies a position of leadership in the Church. It would seem necessary, for example, on the basis of recent research procedures, that we do not depend too much on organizational groups which presuppose a more or less inflexible program. Possibly the fact that we rarely have more than one third to one half of our young people in the church societies intended for them is explained by this condition. In the relationships which we have now largely established the natural group will hardly have an opportunity to develop. That is, we have young people's societies of all kinds with constitutions and by-laws and regulations and resolutions and programs for the most part fully prepared, cut and dried, which are then offered to the prospective members, to be used in the identical way by practically every one whose name appears on the roster of the respective society. It is a take-it-or-leave-it proposition which, in most cases, does not even allow for interest groups. Where this situation obtains, we are not dealing with group work, but with work with

groups. Group work implies, as its fundamental consideration, that activities grow out of capacities and interests of the folks who compose a group. It is most obvious that this sort of work calls for the highest type of leadership; for in such circumstances the leader must be able to suggest, advise, and guide without making his leadership an obtrusive factor.

This new type of leadership frankly asks much of the leader. He must, for example, possess a large measure of wisdom in dealing with people, a kind of community intelligence. He must manage to acquire a great deal of ingenuity in dealing with, and utilizing, resources required for the program which his group decides upon. His must be a long patience, a sincere tolerance, a sense of humor, a democratic attitude and procedure, emotional maturity, a deep happiness in his work. But while he shows a positive and constructive interest in every department of cultural activity, he ought to possess some acknowledged skill in a particular field, so that he will not be branded as an amateur in every line of endeavor.

As the leader studies the objectives which are prescribed or suggested in the Bible with reference to information and training for a wholesome and valuable life of service, he will manage to fit into the large framework of his ideal all the small details by which he will develop the talents of young people who are looking to him for direction and guidance. More and more he will endeavor to get away from regimented work with groups, while he constantly endeavors to promote group work. For group work is a "voluntary activity, in leisure time, under the direction of a leader, with a limited number of participants, placing the emphasis on the individual in the group." Only under such circumstances will social work, activity in a group, really be of benefit to the individual and offer him cultural and social advancement, together with an opportunity for better service of his God and Savior as well as of his fellow-men.

The demands made upon the leader, according to this program, include the following items: constant spiritual and mental growth; training for skills, activities, and interests; emphasis shifted to the individual and his needs, particularly in evaluating and utilizing life situations; cooperatively planned programs, which recognize individual talents and capacities and put them to the best use. The leader must endeavor to win a place in the group, chiefly on the strength of his being saturated with ideas for promoting the welfare of the group and the larger sphere which the group is trying to serve. He must make every effort to build up at least a large measure of personal loyalty in the group. He must carefully cultivate a sense of humor, especially for his work with young people in early adolescence. He must build up cordial relationships and

mutual helpfulness in the group by means of definite contributions on the part of every member. He must have confidence in his group and its component parts, based on a genuine interest in every one and an understanding of the interests and ambitions of the group, individually and collectively. With these and other considerations to guide us, we may hope to make some headway in finding a right solution of the young people's problem.

P. E. KRETZMANN

## Entwürfe über die von der Synodalkonferenz angenommene Epistelreihe

### Siebter Sonntag nach Trinitatis

Ep h. 4, 29—32

„Wir ist ein geistlich Kirchelein“ usw. Lied 334, 1. 2.

Ja, die Heilige Dreieinigkeit wohnt in den Herzen aller wahrhaft Gläubigen. Und das wird in der Heiligen Schrift als einer der Gründe angegeben, weshalb wir Christen das Arge hassen und dem Guten anhangen sollen. Sonst würden wir die Heilige Dreieinigkeit betrüben. Darauf nimmt auch der Apostel Paulus Bezug im vorliegenden 4. Kapitel des Epheserbriefs. Überschrift: „Ermahnung zur Gottseligkeit“ usw. Zunächst, weil Gott der Vater, der allmächtige Schöpfer, allezeit bei uns ist: „Ziehst den neuen“ usw., V. 24. Wir sollen danach trachten, dem Ebenbilde Gottes immer näher zu kommen. Sodann, weil wir den Sohn, unsern Heiland, im Herzen haben, sollen wir gottselig leben usw., V. 13. Das Leben Jesu soll unser Vorbild sein. Endlich — und das vergessen wir leicht — sollen wir wegen der Einwohnung des Heiligen Geistes auf der Hut sein vor der Sünde usw. 1 Kor. 3, 16. 17. Auf die Gegenwart des Heiligen Geistes in unsern Herzen als eine Triebfeder zu christlichem Leben weist der Apostel besonders hin in den Schlußversen dieses Kapitels, die unsern heutigen Text bilden, V. 30. Unsere heutigen Warnungen vor gewissen Sünden und unsere Ermahnungen zur Gottseligkeit gründen sich auf die Worte:

### „Betrübet nicht den Heiligen Geist!“

1. Den Heiligen Geist kann man betrüben.

a. Er ist eine Person der Gottheit, nicht etwa nur eine Eigenschaft. Hier ist eine der klaren Stellen, wo von ihm als von einer Person geredet wird: „Der Heilige Geist Gottes.“ Eine Kraft, Eigenschaft usw. kann man nicht betrüben; eine Person wohl. Das ist freilich auf menschliche Weise geredet; denn in seinem Wesen ist der Geist Gottes unveränderlich. „Bei ihm ist kein Wechsel der Freude und des Schmerzes, des Fröhlichseins und der Betrübniß. Was aber der Apostel hiermit sagen wollte, ist nicht schwer zu erraten. Jemanden betrüben heißt es ver-

schulden, daß sich ein anderer nicht über uns freuen kann, sondern Ursache hat, sich über uns zu betrüben.“ (D. Balthier.)

b. Daß der Heilige Geist eine Person ist und daher betrübt werden kann, ersehen wir auch aus B. 30b. Vgl. 1. 13. 14. Er ist ein Siegel, das uns Gott ausdrückt, Röm. 8, 16 (Epistel für nächsten Sonntag). Das Siegel des Heiligen Geistes soll uns unsern Gnadenstandes gewiß machen, 2 Tim. 2, 19. Nicht nur die Kinderschaft Gottes, sondern auch die Heiligung des Lebens ist Wirkung des Siegels, womit wir versiegelt sind auf den Tag der Erlösung. Wenn wir nicht ein heiliges Leben führen, betrüben wir den Heiligen Geist. Darum:

## 2. Wie betrüben die Menschen den Heiligen Geist?

Das zeigt der Apostel nicht etwa im allgemeinen, sondern er redet von gewissen Sünden, die wir im täglichen Leben begehen.

a. Zunächst wird der Heilige Geist durch Zungensünden betrübt. Schon in B. 25 davon die Rede; in unserm Text B. 29; vgl. 5, 4. Moralisch faule Reden betrüben den Heiligen Geist, Matth. 12, 36. Alle Zungensünden betrüben den Geist der Wahrheit.

b. Herzenssünden. Schon in B. 26; so auch B. 31. Wenn unsere Mitmenschen durch unsern Zorn, Haß usw. betrübt werden, so gewiß der Heilige Geist, der in uns wohnt. „Das Betrüben des Heiligen Geistes besteht darin, daß man das nicht tut, wozu man vom Heiligen Geist angetrieben wird.“ (D. Balthier.) Wenn wir gegen unser Gewissen handeln, handeln wir gegen diesen Geist. „Die Heiligung und Erneuerung des Menschen schließt auch die Heiligung und Erneuerung des Gewissens in sich, nicht unmittelbar, sondern durchs Wort.“ (Syn.-Ver. d. Nebr.-Dist. 1894, S. 20.) Laßt uns diese Stimme nicht verachten, weder in Gedanken, Worten noch Taten; sonst betrüben wir den Heiligen Geist.

## 3. Was soll uns nun endlich bewegen, den Heiligen Geist nicht zu betrüben?

a. Zunächst unsere Versiegelung, B. 30b, von der wir schon gesprochen haben. Wir gehören dem Heiligen Geist an. „Man drückt dem sein Siegel auf, was man für sein erklären will im Gegensatz zu fremdem Anspruch.“ (Hofmann.)

b. Der Heilige Geist will uns im Glauben erhalten, versiegeln „auf den Tag der Erlösung“. Wir wollen doch nicht, daß er betrübt von uns geht. Vielmehr wollen wir ihn erfreuen, indem wir nach B. 32 handeln. 1. Wenn wir freundlich sind im Hause, im Umgang mit Leuten, in der Gemeinde, so erfreut das den Heiligen Geist. 2. Wir wollen herzlich, barmherzig sein gegen alle, die unsere Liebe und Hilfe bedürfen. 3. Ver söhnlich wollen wir sein, gleichwie Gott uns vergeben hat in Christo. Wie betrübt ist doch dieser gute Geist, wenn Christen in Unversöhnlichkeit leben, die fünfte Bitte beten und doch usw. Lied 140, 7. 8; 128, 3.

Durch Betrübung des Heiligen Geistes würden wir ja den vertreiben, der allein uns im Glauben erhalten und selig machen kann. Das wollen wir doch nicht! Darum betrübt nicht usw.

Schluß. O hüten wir uns vor dieser großen Sünde, den Heiligen Geist zu betrüben! Denn es ist eine große Herablassung, daß er im Herzen eines armen Sünders wohnt und wirkt. Wir hindern uns an unserm eigenen Heil und können gar in das Gericht der Verstockung fallen. (S. Weichtrede von D. Walthers in „Predigtentwürfe“.) Gebrauch wir fleißig Wort und Sakrament, damit der Heilige Geist uns durch diese Gnadenmittel Kraft gebe, ihn nicht zu betrüben, sondern zu erfreuen.

Karl A. Gieseler

### Achter Sonntag nach Trinitatis

1 Joh. 4, 1—9

Der eben verlesene Text enthält diese überaus traurige Wahrheit: „Es sind viele falsche Propheten ausgegangen in die Welt.“ Das ist nur allzu wahr, und wer es nicht glauben will, kann bald sehr traurige Erfahrungen machen; denn die Welt ist voller Lug und Trug.

Traurig ist diese Wahrheit auch darum, weil man doch meinen sollte, daß selbst Betrüger sich nicht unterstehen würden, in Gottes Namen Seelen zu verführen. Aber gerade in Sachen der ewigen Wahrheit, der Heiligen Schrift, in Gottes Sachen, gibt es viele falsche Propheten und Betrüger, Matth. 24, 24; 7, 15. Das war nicht nur damals so, das ist ganz besonders jetzt der Fall. Wir müssen noch immer klagen: Lieb 166, 2; 165, 6.

Bei dem Klagen dürfen wir es aber nicht betwenden lassen. Wir sollen uns vorsehen vor den falschen Propheten. Wir sollen, wie das unser Text ausdrückt, die Geister prüfen; denn falsche Propheten sind die allergefährlichsten Menschen, und hintwiederum sind wahre Propheten Gottes die allerköstlichsten Gaben unsers himmlischen Vaters. Wir wollen deswegen ja wohl aufmerken auf die klare Antwort, die unser Text uns auf die Frage gibt:

**Worauf haben wir genau zu achten, wenn wir die Geister prüfen?**

1. Auf ihr Bekenntnis von Christo
2. Auf ihr ganzes Treiben

#### 1

a. Text, B. 2. Also auf das, was der Lehrer von Christo bekennt und lehrt, sollen wir achten. Es genügt nicht, daß ein Prediger das Stehlen, das Morden und andere grobe Sünden verurteilt; das tut ja schon die Obrigkeit. Ja, das tut schon unser eigenes Gewissen. Sondern was sagt der Lehrer von Jesu? Darauf kommt alles an.



b. Es gibt Prediger, die wenig oder nichts von Christo sagen, sondern allerlei irdische Weisheit predigen. Weil sie von Christo nicht die Wahrheit bekennen wollen und sich doch fürchten, geradezu mit ihrem Unglauben grob herauszufahren, so umgehen sie die Sache ganz und gar. Das ist aber eine grobe Verleugnung Christi. Das sind falsche Propheten, wenn sie auch sonst die Wahrheit reden.

c. Sodann gibt es auch solche, die zwar von Christo lehren; aber was lehren sie? Sie sagen, Jesus Christus sei zwar ein sehr guter Mensch gewesen, vielleicht der allerbeste Lehrer, den es je auf Erden gegeben hat, aber er sei nicht der fleischgewordene Gottessohn. Vor solchen falschen Lehrern sollen wir fliehen, sie meiden, verachten und verurtheilen, W. 3.

d. Es gibt aber auch Lehrer, die wohl bekennen: Ja, Jesus Christus ist wahrer Gott, er ist ins Fleisch gekommen, aber sie leugnen, daß er für alle Sünden genuggetan hat; sie leugnen, daß durch sein Leiden und Sterben und durch seinen tätigen Gehorsam Gottes Forderungen an uns Genüge geschehen ist und wir von Sünde, Tod und Teufel erlöst sind. Sie leugnen, daß Gott uns das schenkt und daß wir es nur durch den Glauben annehmen dürfen und sollen. Wer dies leugnet, der raubt dem Christen seinen ganzen geistlichen Reichtum. Vor solchen falschen Lehrern sollen wir uns hüten. Der Geist aus Gott bezeugt: „Glaube an den Herrn“ usw., Act. 16, 31; Röm. 3, 28.

Anwendung. Willst du sicher gehen und fähig sein, die wahren Propheten von den falschen wohl zu unterscheiden, so merke vor allen Dingen auf ihre Lehre von Christo. Ist Kern und Stern der Predigt Jesus Christus, der Gefreuzigte? Lehrt dein Prediger, daß Jesus Christus wahrer Gott von Ewigkeit ist und auch wahrer Mensch, von der Jungfrau Maria geboren? Bezeugt er dir, daß dieser Jesus Christus für dich das Gesetz erfüllt hat, für dich am Kreuz gestorben ist, dich von Tod, Teufel, Sünde, Hölle erlöst hat? Bietet er diese Güter dir an im Wort und im heiligen Sakrament? Versichert er dir, daß Gott dir diese geistlichen Reichthümer schenkt, daß du sie durch den Glauben allein annehmen sollst? Dann ist dein Prediger ein Geist von Gott. Durch diese Lehre wirst du sicher geführt durch dieses Leben; durch diese Lehre wirst du sicher geführt durch das finstere Todestal; durch gläubige Annahme dieser Lehre wirst du endlich das himmlische Erbe, das Christus dir erworben hat, in ewigen Besitz nehmen. Lied 235, 9.

## 2

Unser Text erinnert aber noch an ein anderes Merkmal der falschen Propheten: ihr Verhalten gegen Gottes Wort, ihr Leben und Reden, worin sich ihre Gesinnung kundgibt.

a. W. 5. 6. Der Sinn der falschen Lehrer ist weltlich. Das zeigt sich darin, daß sie nicht auf Gottes Wort, sondern auf die Welt hören. Wir haben in der Heiligen Schrift das Wort Gottes. Durch dies Wort

redet Gott selbst mit uns, 2 Petr. 1, 21; 1 Kor. 2, 13. Nur das ist ein rechter Prediger, der mit heiliger Ehrfurcht auf die Heilige Schrift hört, nur das predigt, was die Heilige Schrift lehrt.

Alle Christen sollen ja auf Gottes Wort hören; aber die Lehrer sollen ganz besonders treu bei Gottes Wort bleiben. Das tun jedoch die falschen Propheten nicht; die haben ihre eigenen Gedanken, ihre eigene Weisheit, ihr weltliches Wissen. Darum vergleiche die Lehre eines jeden Predigers mit dem unfehlbaren Gotteswort. Weicht er in irgendeinem Stück von der Schrift ab und beharrt er in dieser seiner Meinung, so ist er ein falscher Prophet, den man meiden muß, Röm. 16, 17.

b. Das wird sich auch oft in ihrem Leben und Reden zeigen. „Sie reden von der Welt“, wie es in unserm Text heißt. Und darauf folgt: „Die Welt hört sie.“ Wir hören öfters von solchen Predigern, die mit hohen Worten und hoher Weisheit der Welt nach der Welt Gelüsten predigen. Da läuft die Welt hin; die Welt hört sie, 2 Tim. 4, 3; 1 Tim. 1, 19; Jes. 30, 10. Sie predigen nicht Buße und Vergebung der Sünden und Heiligung des Lebens, sondern weisen auf sich selbst, suchen ihre eigene Ehre, lassen die Sünder in allerlei Lastern leben und verkaufen ihnen dann die falsche Münze des Ablasses oder trösten sie mit der bürgerlichen Ehrbarkeit oder rühmen der Sünder Treiben, wenn sie sich nur zu ihnen bekennen, sie ehren und sie füttern, Jer. 5, 31. Der Geist, der aus Gott ist, predigt dem Sünder Buße, wie es Johannes der Täufer und alle Propheten, wie es Jesus und alle Apostel, wie es Luther und alle Lehrer aus Gott getan haben.

Seht, wer könnte hiernach nicht die Geister prüfen? Nach diesen Merkmalen haben die ersten Christen, ja die schwächsten Christen die Geister geprüft. Das wollen wir auch fleißig tun und uns ja vor falschen Propheten hüten. Das sind die allergefährlichsten Menschen auf Erden. Wir wollen uns treu zu den wahren Lehrern halten und dies köstliche Gut ja schätzen; denn von diesen wahren Lehrern heißt es: Luk. 10, 16. Lied 174, 1.

Martin C. Sommer

### Neunter Sonntag nach Trinitatis

1 Tim. 6, 6—10

Jede Sünde ist eine Übertretung des göttlichen Gesetzes und verdammte daher den Menschen, Jak. 2, 10, wenn er nicht durch Christi Blut davon gereinigt wird. Jede Sünde kann unsere Seligkeit gefährden; darum dürfen wir keine gering achten und müssen uns vor jeder warnen lassen. Aber doch müssen wir vor bestimmten Sünden ganz besonders und immer wieder warnen; sie sind entweder Lieblingsünden oder herrschen besonders in einer Gegend oder umstricken auch den Christen sehr leicht. Eine solche Sünde ist der Geiz. Darum warnt die Schrift so oft und mit solch ernstlichen Worten vor dieser Sünde; im Neuen Testament z. B. Matth. 6, 24 ff.; Mark. 7, 22; Eph. 5, 23; Kol. 3, 5. Warnende

Beispiele sind z. B. Achan, Gehazi, Judas, Ananias und Sapphira. Mit diesen Worten und Beispielen hat der Heilige Geist nicht nur die Gottlosen im Sinn, sondern er will auch die Christen ermahnen und warnen. Seine Jünger warnt Jesus Luk. 12, 15. Dem Gottesknecht Timotheus gilt das Wort: Fleuch solches! 1. Th. 6, 10. Wenn schon er diese Ermahnung nötig hatte, wieviel mehr dann wir!

### Hütet euch vor dem Geiz!

1. Worin besteht diese Sünde?
2. Warum sollen wir uns davor hüten?

#### 1

Wenn unser alter Adam eine Predigt über den Geiz anhören muß, versucht er den Eindruck zu verwischen, indem er allerlei Einwände vorbringt. Er meint, wir müßten zugrunde gehen, wenn wir die Ermahnung ernst nähmen. Darum wollen wir zuerst zeigen, was nicht damit gemeint ist, wenn der Herr uns vor dem Geiz warnt.

Das ist nicht Geiz, wenn wir mit Ausbietung der Kräfte Leibes und der Seele arbeiten, um Nahrung und Kleider zu haben, 1. Kor. 9, 8. Die Arbeit gehört ja zur Schöpfungsordnung Gottes, 1. Mos. 2, 15. Gott könnte uns das alles ohne Mittel geben, aber das ist nicht seine Weise, 2. Thess. 3, 8; Spr. 12, 11; 13, 4. Darum gebietet er auch 2. Thess. 3, 10—12. Freilich müssen wir dabei Ps. 127, 1 im Auge behalten. — Das ist nicht Geiz, wenn wir das Unfere zu Rate halten, Spr. 13, 11; Joh. 6, 13. — Das ist nicht Geiz, wenn einer reich ist, mehr hat, als er zum Leben nötig hat, 1. Tim. 6, 17. Zwar gilt ihm Matth. 19, 23, aber ebenso gewiß Matth. 19, 26.

Wenn also der alte Adam während der Predigt mit diesen oder ähnlichen Einwänden kommt, so hört nicht auf ihn und laßt euch nicht von dem ablenken, was Gott euch sagen will.

Was ist denn der Geiz, vor dem wir uns hüten sollen? Das zeigt uns 1. Kor. 9a. Das ist Geiz, wenn man es sich als Lebensziel setzt, reich zu werden, wenn man irdischen Besitz als das wertvollste Gut betrachtet, dessen Verlust das größte Unglück ist, wenn wir unser Herz an den Reichtum hängen, Ps. 62, 11.

Reich werden wollen bedeutet nicht soviel wie ein Millionär sein wollen. Das ist Geiz, wenn man nicht zufrieden ist mit dem, was Gott uns gibt, 1. Kor. 9, 8. Das ist eine Form des Geizes, wenn man immer klagt und unzufrieden ist, obwohl man zu essen und zu trinken und ein Dach über dem Kopf hat. Matth. 6, 31. 32. — Das ist Geiz, wenn man auf den ungewissen Reichtum hofft, 1. Kor. 13, 17, wenn man meint, daß die Zukunft sicher stehe, weil man Geld habe, und nur deswegen, Luk. 12, 19.

Der Geiz ist also so recht eine Herzenssünde, die von andern oft gar nicht erkannt wird und die wir leicht übersehen. Es gilt, die Ermahnung des Herrn zu beachten, denn diese Sünde ist höchst gefährlich.

## 2

Der Apostel sagt: „Die fallen in Versuchung und Stricke.“ Wie ein Wild ganz unerwartet in das Netz des Jägers gerät und sich nicht wieder befreien kann, so wird der Mensch durch den Geiz in allerlei Versuchungen gelockt, aus denen er sich nicht wieder befreien kann; er wird vielmehr des Teufels und der Sünde Knecht. Solche Versuchungen sind z. B. Versäumen des Gottesdienstes, Lügen um Gewinnes willen, Unbarmherzigkeit gegen den Mitmenschen, Diebstahl, Betrug.

Daraus folgen viele Lüste, sündliche Begierden, böse Triebe, die die guten Triebe aus dem Herzen vertreiben. Was der Geizige zuerst nur einmal getan, wird bei ihm zur Gewohnheit. Denken wir nur an viele betrügerische Kniffe im Geschäft und andere törichte und schädliche Lüste, zu welchen der Geiz, die Geldliebe, den Menschen verführt. Ja, Geiz ist eine Wurzel alles Übels; schädlich und vom Übel für andere Menschen, da der Geizige seinem Mitmenschen schadet und alle Liebe und Gerechtigkeit gegen ihn aus seinem Herzen ausrottet. Vor allem schadet der Geizige sich selbst. Das gilt schon in diesem Leben, Pred. 6.

Der Schade und das Übel hören mit diesem Leben nicht auf. Die Lüste versenken den Menschen ins Verderben und Verdamnis. Das Ende des Geizigen ist der ewige Tod; denn der Geiz ist Abgötterei, Kol. 3, 5; Matth. 6, 23 ff. Der Geiz und der Glaube können nicht in demselben Herzen wohnen; wer dem Geiz ergeben ist, kann nicht mit Wahrheit sagen: Mein Jesus ist mein größter Schatz. Und ohne Jesus kann man nicht selig werden.

Gerade wir Christen haben Ursache, uns vor dem Geiz zu hüten. R. 10b. Denken wir an Judas. Er war nicht der einzige Geizige in der ersten Christenheit. Wenn wir immer wieder die Klage hören, daß die Kirche und die Synode so viel Geld kosten, dann merkt man, daß diese Worte des Apostels auch auf die äußere Christenheit unserer Lage Anwendung finden. Wohl macht am Anfang das Gewissen solchen Leuten viele Schmerzen, aber leider ertönen viele diese Stimme und gehen ewig verloren.

Hüten wir uns also vor dem Geiz. Es gilt wachen, flehen, beten. Bist du in dieses Netz des Teufels gefallen? Bedenke, du mußt in der Kraft Gottes diese Stricke zerreißen. Nimm also deine Zuflucht zu Jesus, der auch den Geizigen wie einen Brand aus dem Feuer herausreißen und sich zu eigen machen kann. Selig ist der Mensch, der Jesus in seinem Herzen für seinen größten Schatz hält. Paul J. Röhneke

### Zehnter Sonntag nach Trinitatis

Apost. 4, 8—20

Man führe den Zusammenhang aus, in dem der Text steht, und die Veranlassung zu dem herrlichen Zeugnis der Apostel Petrus und Johannes vor dem Hohen Rat. Kap. 3 und 4. Von Christo zu zeugen, Mission zu treiben, ist die große Aufgabe aller Christen. Jede Gelegenheit, dies

einzelnen oder gemeinschaftlich, persönlich oder durch andere zu tun, ist wahrzunehmen. Gott Lob! keine Obrigkeit verbietet uns das. Gleichwohl wollen uns Teufel, Welt und besonders unser Fleisch dies wehren. Die gegenwärtige Notlage in unserer Synodalarbeit ist zum großen Teil darauf zurückzuführen. Gott gebe uns Gnade, allen Einwürfen und Hindernissen gegenüber mit den Aposteln entschlossen zu erklären:

**„Wir können's ja nicht lassen, daß wir nicht reden sollten“**

1. Gott hat es geboten
2. Das Heil der Welt erfordert unser Zeugnis
3. Unser Zeugnis von Christo ist unumstößlich wahr

### 1

A. B. 19 berufen sich die Apostel auf Gottes Gebot. Frisch in ihrem Gedächtnis war noch die Weisung des Heilandes Kap. 1, 18; Matth. 28, 18—20; Mark. 16, 15. Sie kannten auch die vielen Gebote Gottes, die er von alters her durch die Propheten in Verbindung mit seinen Verheißungen seinem Volk gegeben hatte, Jes. 40, 9; 43, 21; u. a. — Diese Gebote gelten allen Christen bis an das Ende der Zeiten, Matth. 28, 20b. Sie gelten dir und mir, unserer Gemeinde, unserer Synode. Das müssen wir immer besser lernen, daß die Mission nicht in unserer Willkür steht, nicht etwa nur ein übriges, gutes Werk ist, sondern auf vielen klaren Geboten unsers Gottes beruht. Sind wir uns dessen gerade auch in diesen Zeiten immer bewußt?

B. Dies Gebot Gottes stand den Aposteln viel höher als alle Menschengebote und Verbote, B. 19. Ja, Gottes Gebot bildete für sie ein unwiderstehliches Muß. B. 20. Freilich nicht ein Muß des Zwanges oder sklavischer Furcht, sondern ein Muß wahrer Gottesfurcht und inniger Liebe. Gen. 39, 9; Joh. 9, 4; 2 Kor. 5, 14. — Was bedeutet der klare Wille unsers Gottes und Heilandes für dich und mich, die wir seiner Liebe alles Gute zu verdanken haben für Zeit und Ewigkeit? Doch wahrlich mehr als alles andere. In gläubigem Gehorsam gegen diesen Willen laßt uns alle Hindernisse, gerade auch die Einwürfe und Verbote des erfinderiſchen bösen Fleisches und Blutes überwinden und sprechen: „Wir können's ja nicht lassen.“

### 2

A. Christus, der Gekreuzigte und Auferstandene, war der ganze Inhalt der Predigt Petri vor dem Volk im Tempel, Kap. 3, wie auch seines Zeugnisses vor dem Rat, B. 8—12. Jesum Christum von Nazareth bekennen die Apostel, der durch seine gewaltigen Zeichen und Wunder und vollends durch seine glorreiche Auferstehung kräftiglich erwiesen war als Sohn Gottes, ja den Gott selbst auferweckt und dadurch sich zu ihm und seinem Erlösungswerk bekannt hatte. In seinem Namen hatten die Apostel das Wunder an dem Lahmen getan.

B. In diesem Jesus allein liegt das Heil der Welt, V. 12.

a) Ohne Jesus kein Heil, keine Seligkeit. In Sünden verlorne Menschen können sich nicht selbst helfen, Röm. 3. Wer Jesus, den Edelstein, verwirft, ist verloren.

b) In dem teuren Jesusnamen ist Heil. Er ist, was sein Name besagt: Heiland, Seligmacher. Er hat durch seinen tätigen und leidenden Gehorsam die Welt erlöst. Wer im Glauben sein Verdienst sich zueignet, ist gerettet.

C. Angesichts dessen, was Christus für die ganze Sünderwelt bedeutet, können die Apostel es nicht lassen, von ihm zu zeugen. Sie selber waren durch Christi Evangelium begnadigte Sünder, Gottes Kinder geworden und konnten es nun nicht kalt und gleichgültig mit ansehen, daß erlöste Sünder im Angesicht der Rettung ewig sterben und verderben sollten. Darum V. 20.

Anwendung. Wer V. 12 wirklich von Herzen glaubt, der kann es auch nicht lassen, in erbarmender Liebe einer verlorne Welt Jesus zu verkündigen. Steht unser Missionseifer immer im rechten Einklang mit unserm Bekenntnis: V. 12?

### 3

Kühn und entschlossen erklären die Apostel: V. 20, weil sie der Wahrheit ihres Zeugnisses von Christo ganz gewiß waren.

A. Sie waren Augen- und Ohrenzeugen dessen gewesen, was sie verkündigten, V. 20b.

B. Zu Pfingsten waren sie vom Heiligen Geist besonders erleuchtet und ihres Zeugnisses göttlich gewiß gemacht worden.

C. Der Hohe Rat selbst mußte die Wahrheit ihres Zeugnisses anerkennen. Sie konnten das Wunder, und somit auch die Beweiskraft des Wunders nicht in Abrede stellen, V. 14. 16. So schon Joh. 11, 47. 48.

Anwendung. a) Das Zeugnis dieser Augen- und Ohrenzeugen steht auch uns zur Verfügung. Es ist durch Eingebung des Heiligen Geistes niedergeschrieben worden. b) Auch heute noch macht uns der Heilige Geist der Wahrheit des Evangeliums göttlich gewiß. c) Bis auf den heutigen Tag haben die Feinde Christi bei allem Scharfsinn die Wahrheit nicht umstoßen können. Um so zuversichtlicher und entschlossener spreche jeder Christ, jede christliche Gemeinde mit Wort und Tat: V. 20. Wie damals, so segnet der erhöhte Heiland unser Zeugnis zu seiner Ehre und zur Rettung vieler teuererkauften Seelen.

Aug. F. Wernthal





---

## Miscellanea

---

### Concerning Conscientious Objectors

The right of Lutherans to be conscientious objectors in time of war was voted unanimously by the executive board of the United Lutheran Church in America during its recent meeting in New York City. Dr. Frederick H. Knubel, President of the United Lutheran Church, presided.

In a "Statement on the Rights and Duties of the Christian Citizen in the Emergencies of War" the executive board expressed its belief that "the conscience of the individual, informed and inspired by the Word of God, is the final authority in determining conduct." In accordance, therefore, with this "principle of freedom of conscience" the board recognized "the individual right to conscientious objection to service in a war."

It was pointed out that this recognition does not necessarily "imply the Church's approval of such conscientious objection but does proclaim its devotion and respect for the Scriptural principle of the supreme moral responsibility of the individual conscience." Because the Church is "the exponent and defender of Christian principle," it must "respect and safeguard the Christian in his right to the honest exercise of that responsibility."

The board also pointed to obvious difficulties, "such as the abuse of the principle by hypocrites, using conscience as a cloak for cowardice." It was stated, however, that this does not "excuse the Church from its sacred obligation of defending the principle at stake." The Church, then, is challenged to exercise special care in judging the spirit and motives of those who claim conscientious objection.

The board made it clear, however, that—in accordance with the Church's confessions—it holds that war may on occasion be justified and that then the "Christian citizen is in duty bound to bear arms and to offer his life, if need be, in defense of his country."

The executive board also voted unanimous commendation of the joint protest issued last week by Dr. Knubel and Dr. Emanuel Poppen of Columbus, O., President of the American Lutheran Church, in which they condemned President Roosevelt's appointment of Myron C. Taylor as a personal representative to the Vatican.

As a result of the criticism Dr. Knubel, together with a few other Protestant Church leaders, was called to Washington for a conference with the President. In reporting the result of this conference to the executive board, Dr. Knubel repeated President Roosevelt's assertion that this action ought not to be regarded as the initiation of formal diplomatic relationships between the United States and the Vatican. Dr. Knubel reported also that he had urged the President to make a public declaration of this fact as soon as possible. He was unable, however, to give details concerning the President's plan for peace because those who attended the conference were pledged to secrecy.

*N. L. C. Bulletin*

### "Need Not Be Divisive"

On account of the importance of the discussions going on now in our and other circles with respect to the resolutions which the Missouri Synod in 1938 passed concerning church-fellowship with the American Lutheran Church, it is proper that we should submit to our readers the concluding remarks of Prof. Martin Graebner, president of Concordia College, St. Paul, Minn., in his essay at the Southern Nebraska District convention of 1939. The paper dealt with Theses 22, 23, and 24 of Dr. Walther's treatise *The Evangelical Lutheran Church the True Visible Church of God on Earth*. Thesis 24 reads: "The Evangelical Lutheran Church holds fellowship in confession and charity with all at one with it in faith, Eph. 4:3." Concluding his remarks on this proposition as well as his essay in general, Professor Graebner analyzed the report of Committee No. 16 as presented to the convention of the Missouri Synod in 1938. We here reprint the last section of this analysis. In the printed report this section will be found p. 40 ff.

"This report of Committee No. 16 was discussed in four sessions and finally adopted and thus became a part of the synodical resolutions. We have already stated that for true unity it is necessary that all parties unite in a single declaration. We shall restrict our examination of these resolutions to the deviations in doctrine which have been described in this report as being not necessarily divisive of church-fellowship.

"We call attention first to the fact that the report does not say that a difference of doctrine is not divisive, but it says, 'It need not be divisive.' Every false opinion is divisive of church-fellowship if it is held with full knowledge of being contrary to the Word of God; but among otherwise orthodox Christians it is not divisive of fellowship. That is the correct understanding of the phrase 'need not be.' Now, then, we ask: If the American Lutheran Church really is orthodox in all matters with the exception of the points noted, did Synod do right in declaring them to be non-divisive of church-fellowship, or did Synod do wrong?

"We examine first the conversion of the Jews. That opinion is based on Rom. 11:25, 26. 'For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits, that blindness in part is happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.' We find no fault with our fathers who declare in *Lehre und Wehre*, 14: 'Im uebrigen stelle ich diese Annahme von der Interzession der Seligen in die Kategorie jener "wunderlichen Meinungen," wie z. B. die von der noch zu hoffenden grossen Judenbekehrung (welche sogar noch einen grosseren Schein von Schriftbeweis fuer sich hat als die vorliegende) usw., und sie wird niemand schaden, der nicht Konsequenzen daraus zieht. Wer so wie die Apologie, die Schmalkaldischen Artikel, wie Chemnitz und Carpzov und die *Confessio Wirtenbergensis* von Christi Amt, Rechtfertigung und den Gnadenmitteln zeugt und glaubt, mag diesen "Traum" immerhin behalten; deshalb ist er doch ein Christ und ein Lutheraner.' We translate as follows: 'As for the rest, I place the assumption of the intercession of the saints into the category of those queer notions as, for instance, that of the hoped-for great conversion

of the Jews, which has an even greater appearance of Scriptural proof in its favor than the one before us, etc., and it will harm nobody who does not draw consequences out of it. Whoever testifies and believes of Christ's office, of justification and the means of grace as does the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, Chemnitz, Carpzov, may, if he desires, keep this dream; in spite of that he is still a Christian and a Lutheran.'

"The conversion of the Jews is consistently rejected by our synodical writers, and yet it is called a queer notion and a dream having only the appearance of Scriptural proof, and our fathers declared this queer notion does not prevent a person from remaining an orthodox Lutheran.

"We now take up the doctrine concerning the physical resurrection of the martyrs. That is a view generally held by millennialists, and if any one draws from such doctrine of the resurrection of the martyrs the doctrine of the millennium, then he ceases to be a Lutheran theologian. We are speaking of people who reject the doctrine of the millennium and yet feel that the Holy Scriptures teach the resurrection of martyrs. Our committee declares that to be contrary to the doctrine of the general resurrection of the dead. It states that, if any one should hold that view, it would not deprive him of his status as an orthodox Lutheran Christian. We do know that, although there is only one resurrection of the dead, yet we learn from Scripture that at the death of Christ many graves of the saints gave up their dead, that God, therefore, actually did resurrect some of His saints before the general resurrection of the dead. We shall furthermore find no fault with any one who, for instance, will claim that Moses has been resurrected from the dead, as it would appear from his appearance on the Mount of Transfiguration. No one will, therefore, deny that God has resurrected some saints and no one will deny that He also has the power to do so in the future. And since God has already resurrected some saints, this goes to prove that the resurrection of some at an earlier time is not in conflict with the doctrine of the general resurrection of the dead. This declaration, then, simply states that, if some one should wish to believe on the basis of Rev. 20:4 that God may do again what He did once, and if such person from such viewpoint does not draw consequences in conflict with Bible doctrines, he may still be regarded as an orthodox Lutheran theologian. Again we can find no fault with that statement.

"The fourth point, concerning the time in which the thousand years of Rev. 20 are fulfilled, has already been dealt with above.

"And finally we come to the point in the doctrine concerning the Church. In distinction from the other points, this point refers to a fundamental doctrine. If this expression 'the visible side of the Church' were permitted to remain unexplained, some think it might give occasion to foster false doctrine, such as the Romanizing teaching which represents the Church as an external religious or social institution.

"The Declaration of the American Lutheran Church, however, accepts the doctrine of the Church as the invisible community of saints and would sanction the expression 'the visible side of the Church' only if by this visible side nothing else is meant than the use of the means of grace. We call the use of the means of grace a *mark* of the Church. And now some call it a visible side of the Church. They substitute for

an expression that cannot be misunderstood one that may be misunderstood, and we therefore believe that the use of this expression should be dropped for that reason. On the other hand, if any man firmly believes the correct doctrines of the Church and then makes use of the expression 'visible side of the Church' with the explanation here given, we cannot find fault with the committee in declaring that a difference in this point need not be divisive of church-fellowship when properly understood. It is better to use different language to mean the same thing than to use the same language with different interpretations. We believe, however, that, since the expression 'a visible side of the Church' may be misunderstood, and since there has been controversy concerning the doctrine of the Church, at least with some of the synods that now constitute the American Lutheran Church, therefore the use of this expression should be discontinued and a declaration should be arrived at which all parties can subscribe to. This is in harmony with the resolution of Synod as above stated.

"In this connection it is well once more to call attention to the fact that the report of Committee No. 16 did not attempt to rush the Synod into a union but distinctly recommended in No. 2 'that Synod declares that the *Brief Statement* of the Missouri Synod, together with the *Declaration* of the representatives of the American Lutheran Church and the provisions of this entire report of Committee No. 16 now being read and with Synod's actions thereupon, be regarded as the doctrinal basis for *future church-fellowship* between the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church.'

"Synod is further on record as resolving that endeavors should be made to establish full agreement on the four points of non-fundamental doctrines above referred to; that concerning 'the visible side of the Church' uniform and Scripturally acceptable terminology and teaching should be attained; that the establishing of church-fellowship will depend on the action taken by each body with reference to the *Brief Statement*, the *Declaration* of the representatives of the American Lutheran Church, and the report of Committee No. 16 as adopted by Synod; that the establishing of church-fellowship will depend also on the establishing of doctrinal agreement between the American Lutheran Church and those church-bodies with which it is now in fellowship; and, as far as the Missouri Synod is concerned, this whole matter must be submitted for approval to the other synods constituting the Synodical Conference. It has also been made very plain in these resolutions that for true unity we need not only doctrinal agreement but also agreement in practice, in which connection the resolutions mention the lodge evil, pulpit- and altar-fellowship, and all forms of unionism. It must be admitted by any fair-minded and unbiased reader of these resolutions that Committee No. 16 and Synod, which adopted this report, did not attempt to rush Synod into a union, but that these resolutions contain all necessary safeguards and should be assented to, and approved by, all of us.

"In summary, we believe that the synodical resolutions have steered clear of the Scylla of unionism on the one side and the Charybdis of separatism on the other side and that they constitute a sound and conservative basis for fellowship in the Lutheran Church."

---

**Theological Observer — Kircklich-Zeitgeschichtliches**

---

**Children's Confirmation Classes.** — In the *American Lutheran* (April, 1940) Dr. O. A. Geiseman offers two editorials which, we believe, should be studied carefully by all pastors in our Synod. The first suggests that adult-membership classes ought to be given opportunity to receive instruction on Sunday, either on Sunday mornings at the Sunday-school hour, or on Sunday afternoons. The suggestion is certainly worth considering. More important still is what Dr. Geiseman says with regard to children's confirmation classes. He writes: "With Pentecost Sunday practically all children's confirmation classes will again have concluded their work of preparation and will have been received into the communicant membership of the Church. If our observations are at all correct, then it would appear as though parents are in increasing numbers becoming worried lest their children be given too much Christian training and instruction. The average child of today finds its life almost as badly atomized as is that of its parents. It flits from one interest or activity to another. It is being rushed hither and yon by its school-work and its participation in extra-curricular activities, which embrace music, athletics, dramatic art, esthetic dancing, scouting, play, social activities, and the like. Parents realize, of course, that such a high-pressure program for their children has its defects, and they are afraid that their children will be crowded beyond endurance. They know that their boys and girls need religion, and they are eager to have them receive the necessary instruction. The mean while, however, they are also greatly troubled lest their children should lose out on something which looks like an earthly advantage or lest they should be crowded with work beyond the limits of their physical endurance. Because of this they often believe that an abbreviated course of religious instruction would prove to be at least a partial solution of the child's difficulties. If the experiences of other pastors are like unto our own, they are asked each year by anxious mothers whether their child must take two years of instruction by way of preparing for confirmation. Such a question is often not intended to show contempt for Christian training but is rather to be understood in the light of parental concern about lightening the load of the child. If parents want to know whether a child must take two years of instruction, the answer, of course, is 'No'; for the Bible nowhere says that this is the required period of time. While there is no 'must' in this matter, yet nothing ought to be left undone to bring the parents to the conviction that they ought to desire and require the very fullest and best kind of instruction which their children might be given. It is our personal view that this can be achieved much better by *counseling with the individual parents than by establishing laws and regulations.* [Italics our own.] Christian parents can and should be shown without much difficulty that they ought to be more than eager to accept not the least but the most instruction for their boys and girls, even as they would certainly prefer a two-year free scholarship in a school of music or a college to a one-year free scholar-

ship for their children in such institutions. If our Church is to be strong in the future and the children of today are not to be overwhelmed by the complexities of modern life and drawn away from the church, then it is inescapably essential that we give our children the very best training we are capable of giving them under the particular circumstances in which we may be doing our work."

What we regard as especially commendable in this editorial is the winsome approach to the often very serious problem of parental resistance to a two-year course of Christian instruction for their children, which, as Dr. Geiseman rightly says, is often motivated not by any contempt for God's Word but by honest concern about the physical endurance of the children. But if there must be any educational unloading, let it not be in the field of Bible instruction but somewhere else; and let Christian parents realize that it is not an irksome duty but a valuable prerogative for Christian children to receive a "two-year free scholarship" in Christian education. Christian education is similar to prayer, which certainly is a duty, inasmuch as God has commanded it. But, oh, what a privilege it is to carry everything to God in prayer, and what a privilege it is to sit at Jesus' feet and hear His Word! J. T. M.

**Lodge Articles Make a Deep Impression.**—Evangelist John R. Rice's articles "Lodges Examined by the Bible," published in the *Sword of the Lord* (201 E. 10th St., Dallas, Tex.) and now being printed for pamphlet use, have made a deep impression on many who read them, if we may believe a report to that effect in the issue of March 15, 1940. Dr. Rice says: "Lodge people have read the articles, sometimes with bitter resentment. Dallas lodge-members got out an anonymous circular, slandering the editor and trying to disrupt the work and organize people against any preacher who might come to Dallas and oppose the lodges.... But almost all the response is favorable, more than we could foresee. From many, many sources come pleas that we print in pamphlet form these messages. In two days, for example, there were eight letters from Lutheran pastors, and many others have come since from Lutherans and Christians of many other faiths. Best of all, we have received word from many who are quitting the lodges." One of these writes: "I had about the same experience as you did in the lodge. I spent good money to get in that I might make some gain, but the first night one man came to me and said, 'Now, isn't this better than church?' I was not saved at that time [he was not yet a believing Christian], but that turned me against lodges. All that you have written about lodges is true. I praise God for your courage. Keep up the good work." Another writes: "I have been reading your articles on the lodges with great interest, and I surely can see the fallacy in a Christian's belonging to a lodge. I myself am a thirty-second degree Mason and can understand what you have been talking about. The main reason I took the higher degrees in Masonry was that I was troubled in soul and therefore thought that perhaps I would find something that would give me ease of conscience. I had been doubting my salvation as to whether I had ever been saved or ever could be. I imagined I had committed the unpardonable sin and everything else imaginable. I was told that



there was greater light in taking the higher degrees. This I did. But I did not find that something for which I was yearning. Masonry does not tell any one about Jesus Christ. It does not point men to the Cross of Christ where they can find peace of soul and mind. Brother Rice, may God's richest blessing be on your ministry, yourself, and family!" Of the pamphlet Evangelist Rice says: "The article is now in the hand of publishers, and we hope it will be printed soon. It will make a pamphlet of one hundred or more pages, will be printed on good paper and with a nice colored cover. As soon as possible we will announce the publication and begin to scatter it to the thousands who are waiting for it." The article closes with the encouraging words: "God is with plain preaching. He will bless the man who risks everything just to preach exactly what the Holy Spirit lays on his heart to be true to the Bible and to win souls from Satan. You may suffer some, but if you suffer in Jesus' name, you will see good fruit for your labor. Be true to the Bible, and the God of the Bible will be true to you."

Owing to a misunderstanding of a report in the *Sword of the Spirit* the undersigned recently stated in *Der Lutheraner* that also Dr. H. A. Ironside, pastor of the Moody Memorial Church, Chicago, was a Mason. Dr. Ironside now writes: "I have never been a member of any lodge in all my life. I thought my stand against these secret oath-bound orders was well known, as I have declared myself again and again regarding the unscripturalness of a Christian's joining them. The *Christian Cynosure* has published a statement from me telling 'Why I Am Not a Lodge Member,' which has been widely circulated." We are glad to publish this letter, not only in fairness to Pastor Ironside, but also because of his clear personal witness against lodges. We are still more glad that the Moody people not only see the incongruity between lodge-membership and Christian church-membership but also have the courage to witness against secret oath-bound societies. Our own testimony against the antichristian lodges ought to be all the more emphatic.

J. T. M.

**Is the Pope the Antichrist?**—Let *America* answer. It publishes in the issue of April 27 an article by Father Bertrand Weaver, C. P., of St. Gabriel's Monastery, Brighton, Mass., entitled: "*By What Authority does the Pope Command?*" from which we quote the following: "Today, the Papacy is the cynosure of the world. . . . We are living at a time when a non-Catholic columnist who has a potential reading public of eight or ten millions will not hesitate to write of the first encyclical of Pius XII: 'Pius XII has brought to bear upon our age understanding born of faith. . . . His words point the way to the synthesis that the human mind is seeking everywhere between individual freedom and social discipline, between liberty and authority.' Gratifying as it is to read this forthright statement by Dorothy Thompson, it is necessary to emphasize that it is incalculably weakened by her leaving unasked and unanswered the question that alone gives the key to the encyclical, the question that the Jews proposed to our Lord: 'By what *authority* doest Thou these things?' *Who* have given Thee this authority? . . . The most unreasonable of all attitudes toward the Papacy is that of neutrality. The Pope is either the supreme head of Christendom, the infallible

teacher of infallible truth, the successor of St. Peter and the vicar of Christ on earth, or he is an impostor with whom no respectable person should have dealings. You can no more be neutral toward the Pope than you can be neutral toward Christ, although many persons who call themselves Christians are attempting this neutrality, with disastrous consequences to the Christianity that they profess. 'He that is not with Me is against Me' is as true of Christ's vicegerent as it is of Christ Himself. . . . To the Macaulays of this generation" (Macaulay "wrote his classic panegyric on the endurance of the Papacy in 1840") "we can propose the kind of dilemma that our Lord proposed to those who questioned His credentials. We can say: The Papacy, whence is it? from heaven or from men? If they answer that it is from heaven, we must ask them why they have not submitted to it. But if they say that it is from men, we find it necessary to ask them to explain the miracle by which a purely human institution has never fallen into error or contradiction on any essential question of faith and morals during nineteen centuries of turbulent history. And when they have explained that miracle, we must ask them to explain another. How does it happen that that institution which has endured ruthless and bloody persecution in almost every country, and whose extinction is ardently desired by numberless persons of every class, possesses, after these hundreds of years, the allegiance of one out of every five human beings on earth?"

One more quotation: "Furthermore, if they insist on believing that the Papacy is from men, they must hold it to be a fraud of gigantic proportions; for no merely human institution could claim without deceit the absolute spiritual authority that the Papacy claims for itself. And then they must tell us how this fraudulent thing, which works in the light of day and which for all these centuries has undergone the most careful scrutiny, has escaped detection and exposure. It is inconceivable that a fraud of world-wide proportions could endure for 2,000 years. And if some say that the Papacy has been exposed, we must reply that very few seem really convinced by the pretended exposure; for no government in the world receives from those who do not give it formal allegiance the sincere honor and respect that non-Catholics in general give the Papacy, and the number of those who are taking the road to Rome is a phenomenon to challenge the attention of the world."

Father Weaver would surely have been amazed if he had read the *News Bulletin* of Jan. 5 to find that in a pronouncement protesting against the appointment of Mr. Taylor as the personal representative of President Roosevelt to the Vatican two Lutheran leaders used the expression: "The Pope is God's servant." Father Weaver would have to tell these Lutherans that they are unreasonable. The Pope is either the supreme head of Christendom, the infallible teacher of spiritual truth, or he is an impostor with whom no respectable person should have dealings. No man who rejects the claim of the Pope that he is infallible and the ruler of the Church can call him God's servant. Lutherans, who believe that the Papacy was not instituted by God but is of men, must hold it to be a fraud of gigantic proportions. Father Weaver cannot

understand how men can call the perpetrator of this gigantic fraud God's servant.

Is the Pope the Antichrist? The Catholics cannot understand how men who sincerely believe that justification, salvation, is by grace alone can deny that. The Catholic theologian Kiefl of Germany tells them that, if Luther's fundamental doctrine, salvation by grace alone, is true, the Catholic Church must be the work of the devil and the Pope, as vicar of Christ, the Antichrist. See *Conc. Theol. Monthly*, II, p. 241.

Father Weaver wants to know how the Papacy, if it is nothing but a fraud of gigantic proportions, could endure so long and command the allegiance of so many. Luther has given him the answer long ago. See Volume XVIII, p. 1528 f. Father Weaver may not have access to this writing of Luther. But some of our readers may look it up and study it. E.

**American Lutheran Educational Conference.**—About seventy educators and administrators representing forty Lutheran colleges, seminaries, and junior colleges of the United Lutheran Church and the American Lutheran Conference assembled in Philadelphia on January 7 for the 27th annual session of the National Lutheran Educational Conference. The general theme of the conference, which lasted until January 9, was "Vital Fronts in Christian Higher Education."

In his opening address on Monday morning, January 8, the president of the conference, Dr. E. J. Braulick of Wartburg College, treated the subject "Changing Frontiers," in which he urged that a "Christ-centered culture" be maintained at Christian higher schools. Dean Minton Kleintop of Wagner College, New York, read a paper on "The Home Front," in which he emphasized the need of a more careful selection of faculty members who would not intentionally or ignorantly snipe at fundamental Christian doctrines and ideals in their classes. This talk concluded the first discussion division entitled "The Christian Culture Front."

In his official report the secretary-treasurer of the conference, Dr. H. J. Arnold, president of Hartwick College, called upon the members "to keep the living Christ in higher education." At the opening business session the question "Should colleges and seminaries of the Missouri Synod be invited to membership?" was introduced and then referred to a special committee for study and recommendation.

At the afternoon session representatives of the publicity department of the various colleges participated in a panel discussion on "How Develop More Effective Methods of Promotion and Publicity for Our Colleges." In the evening an open forum was held on "The Christian Church and Democracy," which was led by Dr. Nathan Melhorn, editor of the *Lutheran*. This aroused considerable interest and spirited debate, but the outcome was a lack of agreement on such questions as "the definition of democracy," "whether the doctrine of separation of Church and State was really a Lutheran doctrine," "whether religious minorities were controlling the nation," "whether the failure of democracy would be a sign that Christianity had failed the people," and "whether we will pass on to the next generation as much freedom as we received."

The theme of the session on Tuesday morning was "Spiritual Welfare Front." President T. F. Gullixson, Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., pre-

sided over this session. Dr. C. E. Krumholz, Secretary of Welfare of the National Lutheran Council, spoke on "College and Seminary Training in Lutheran Welfare Leadership." He stressed the importance of thorough courses in welfare leadership and institutional administration and severely criticized a hit-or-miss method in developing leaders in church social work. He said: "Seminary students should receive sufficient clinical work as to make them aware of good scientific practices in community welfare."

The Rev. Martin Schroeder of Lincoln, Nebr., then addressed the meeting on "The Need of a Faithful and Persevering Ministry to the Dispossessed in Rural Communities." He deplored the heavy losses suffered by the Lutheran Church in poor communities and said that the Pentecostal churches were profiting. He charged that many a minister cannot speak the language of the poor because he does not know the lives of the poor and that poverty and the Lutheran Church do not mix. To minister effectively to the dispossessed and the suffering poor is a matter of adjustment and sacrifice. He urged the seminaries to return more candidates to rural communities and warned that rural people do not want ministers who look upon rural charges merely as stepping-stones to something better.

Dr. Bertha Paulsen of Wagner College, an authority on welfare work in Europe, said that a recent survey revealed that there are 10,000 unchurched Lutherans in upper Manhattan. In closing the discussion, Dr. Gullixson stated that "no man can minister to another in spiritual things across an economic abyss" and urged the delegates to study the noun "poor" in Holy Scripture and pressed the question, "Who shall preach the Gospel to the Lutheran poor?"

In the closing session reports were given by the "Committee on Research on the Status of Personnel Service in the Lutheran Colleges." The convention adopted a threefold program for the next year, calling for an achievement course in every Lutheran college, giving orientation tests for achievement, accomplishment, and enrolment mortality.

In the annual election Dr. J. C. Kinard of Newberry College was chosen president of the conference, and Dr. Arnold was reelected secretary-treasurer. It was decided unanimously to extend a courteous invitation to the colleges and seminaries of the Missouri Synod.

E. H. BEHRENS

**Southern Presbyterians Still Opposing Church Union.**—According to the *Christian Beacon* (March 21, 1940, "Bible Presbyterian" periodical) there are still elders in the Southern Presbyterian Church conservative enough to demand that the "Committee on Cooperation and Church Union of the Southern Presbyterian Church be continued and that the Southern Church state its own terms of union with the North." In the plea the following two matters are emphasized: "Any form of union, organic or federal, which could properly be called union, would bring about a mingling and a fusion of the two doctrinal currents now existent in the bodies and represented in the beliefs of their ministers. The Northern Church has in it, in high places, outstanding and blatant unbelievers. This alone should deter any true Christian Church from any kind of union with such a body until the unbelievers are removed

and the sin of harboring them is confessed. Many a woman will testify that the time to reform a man is before marriage, not afterward. The real question at stake in these union discussions is: 'How serious do the men of the South consider doctrinal unsoundness in a Church?' If they do not consider it a serious impediment to union with the North, then they do not consider doctrine very essential to their own fellowship, and this only serves to make us realize the condition of the Southern Church itself. Again, union is in the air. Centralization and control from the top appear to be the order of the day in the Church. Any loose federal union which might be consummated, if such were possible, would soon result, after a few years of operation, in a strengthened, centralized authority. Notice the so-called Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. It is supposed to be a loosely federated group, and yet, when it issues its pronouncements, it does so in the name of the millions of members which it claims to represent. But the most serious aspect of this 'union in the air' attitude is that any step of union with the South and the North is only the first step. It is merely the beginning. The cry is for a united Christian Church to fulfil, in the opinion of the leaders, the prayer of Christ 'that they may be one, even as We are one.' This interpretation of that prayer, of course, we believe is wrong. But any step toward union is only the first step, and any man who realizes the condition in Protestantism in America must recognize this, or else he is blind. Sad and tragic — Protestantism wants to imitate Rome! It feels that it must have one voice representing all the people. Union is more important than the doctrine of Christ. One man said he believed Christ was more interested in seeing churches united in one testimony than in having the ministers believe in His virgin birth." It is gratifying that the *Christian Beacon* calls attention to the fact that John 17:11 b, as here applied, is really a misinterpretation of the words of Christ. As Luther already pointed out, they refer not to any unity of mind and sentiment nor even primarily to the unity of faith, but to the *unio mystica* in Christ, which all believers possess and enjoy, and of which St. Paul speaks in 1 Cor. 10:17 and 12:12, 13. Luther writes: "Christus spricht ja nicht also, dass sie *einen* Willen oder Verstand haben, wie sie hineintreiben, wiewohl das auch wahr ist, dass die Christen alle *eines* Glaubens, Liebe, Verstands und Sinnes seien, als die *einen* Christum, Geist und Glauben haben. . . . Aber er redet hier nicht von der Einigkeit, die da heisst eine Gleichheit, sondern setzt die Worte also, *ut sint unum*, dass sie *ein Ding* seien und *also ein Ding wie der Vater und ich*, also dass es *vom Wesen gesagt sei* [italics our own] und viel weiter deute denn einerlei Mut und Sinn haben. Was aber das eine oder einerlei Ding sei, werden wir nicht sehen noch greifen, sondern muessen's glauben. Es ist aber nichts anderes, denn das Paulus 1 Kor. 10:17 und 12:12 und an mehr Orten sagt, dass wir Christen alle *ein Leib* sind; wie nun der Leib *ein Ding* ist und heisst, so heisst die ganze Christenheit *ein Leib* oder *ein Kuche*, nicht allein der einigen oder gleichen Gedanken, sondern vielmehr *des einigen Wesens halben*." (Italics our own. *St. L. ed.*, VIII, 804 ff.) Again: "Also meint's nun Christus hier auch, dass seine Christen sollen also aneinander hangen, dass sie ganz ein einzig Ding und ein unzertrennter Leib

seien und bleiben, gleichwie er und der Vater eines sind. Das ist nicht allein ein Sinn und Wille, sondern ein ganz einig, unzertrennt Wesen." (*Ibid.*) And: "Durch das Wort werden wir Christo eingeleibt, dass alles, was er hat, unser ist und wir uns sein annehmen koennen als unsers eigenen Leibes; wiederum auch er alles, was uns widerfaehrt, sich annehmen muss, dass uns weder Welt, Teufel noch kein Unglueck schaden noch ueberwaeltigen kann; denn es ist keine Gewalt auf Erden so gross, die wider diese Einigkeit etwas vermoege." Briefly expressed, it may also be said that Christ here prays that His disciples and those who shall believe on Him through their word (17:20) might through faith, by virtue of His efficacious Word, be preserved in the *communio sanctorum* (so also Luther), which is the one body of Christ, Eph. 1:23. Nowhere in the sacerdotal prayer is there any indication that Christ in this great intercession had in mind any external union of professing Christians. J. T. M.

Die achte Tagung der Luther-Akademie in Sondershausen. In der „Theologischen Quartalschrift“ (Jahrg. 37, Nr. 2) veröffentlicht D. P. Peters, jetzt Professor am Seminar der Ebrv. Synode von Wisconsin u. a. Staaten, in Thiensville, Wis., einen längeren Bericht über die achte Tagung der Luther-Akademie in Sondershausen, die er letzten Sommer vom 6.—20. August mit P. Martin Hein besuchte. Der Bericht wäre es wert, daß er hier ganz abgedruckt würde, eben weil er auf so vielerlei aus den Verhandlungen so äußerst verständnisvoll eingeht und dazu treffliche Bemerkungen liefert. Einberufen war die Akademie von Prof. D. Carl Stange aus Göttingen; zugegen waren Vertreter aus vierzehn verschiedenen Völkern, unter ihnen auch P. D. Heid und Prof. Dr. Tappert aus der U. L. C. A., die über Themata aus der Geschichte der lutherischen Kirche in Amerika redeten. Das Hauptreferat lieferte Prof. D. Nygren aus Lund, Schweden, über „die Ethik der Rechtfertigung“, ein zweites Prof. D. Rejebösk aus Finnland über „die Rechtfertigungslehre der lutherischen Dogmatiker“. Hierzu bemerkt D. Peters: „Hier war Gelegenheit gegeben zu zeigen, wie das Luthertum in Deutschland, trotzdem es sich dort um keinen Sprachenwechsel handeln kann, oft unlutherischen Strömungen weichen muß, wie aber die Fortdauer des Luthertums als rechte Lehre letzten Endes von der Gnade Gottes abhängt, ohne daß deswegen in Vergessenheit geraten darf, welch eine Bedeutung die deutsche Sprache als Scheide für die lutherische Lehre einnimmt. So wurde man auch in diesem Zusammenhang der Bedeutung, die die Gemeindefschule in Amerika zur Verbeibaltung der deutschen Sprache gehabt hat, vollends gerecht.“ Zu den weiteren Themen und Vorträgen (e. g. „Die slavische Leidensmythik und das Mysterium der christlichen Passion“, „Der leidende Christus und das Problem des Leidens“: Oberpfarrer D. W. Grüner und Prof. D. Frjö J. E. Alanen, Helsinki) bemerkt D. Peters: „Unsere Erfahrung innerhalb der zwei Wochen war diese, daß uns wohl keine ökumenische Tagung eine solche Fülle von nachhaltigen Eindrücken zu geben und zu hinterlassen vermocht hätte als nun gerade die Tagung der Luther-Akademie.“ Ferner: „Die studierende Jugend will z. B. die endlosen Ausführungen der höheren Kritik über alt- und neutestamentliche Quellen nicht mehr mit anhören. Theologie will sie hören und wenigstens eine Theologie, die es ihr ermöglicht, mit den Problemen der Zeit in etwas fertig zu werden. . . . So war es ein Zeichen der Zeit, daß wir auf dieser Tagung Theologen



hörten, die sich einerseits durch gründliches Wissen hervortaten, andererseits aber auch auf die Hauptfragen der Theologie eingingen. In dieser Hinsicht zeichneten sich die deutschen Theologen durch ihre Gründlichkeit und Wissenschaftlichkeit immer noch vor den meisten ihrer ausländischen Kollegen aus."

Vor allem wichtig erschien uns aber ein anderes, nämlich: „Trotz aller Korrektur, die an der Theologie vorgenommen wird, stehen Theologen in Deutschland immer noch unter dem starken Eindruck der Leistungen von Gelehrten wie Harnack, R. Seeberg und Tröltzsch. . . ." „Als eine sehr wichtige Vorlesung in der ganzen Reihe der Vorlesungen und Vorträge dieser Tagung ist die von Oberpfarrer Thompson, Bernau (Estland), über „Heilige Schrift und Offenbarung“ gehaltene anzusehen, umsomehr, da er die ganze Frage der Inspiration aufrollte. Der Vortragende selber schwamm ganz und gar in dem Fahrwasser Barth'scher Theologie und ließ überhaupt nicht eine Inspiration des geschriebenen Worts gelten. Bei diesem Vortrag konnte man auf die Aussprache gespannt sein. In ihr wurde seitens eines deutschen Theologen besonders darauf Gewicht gelegt, daß das eigentliche Problem von dem Vortragenden nicht berührt worden sei. Dieses Problem — so wurde ausgeführt — finde seinen Ausdruck in der Tatsache, daß der einsfältige Christ die Bibel Wort für Wort als Gottes Wort betrachte und den Theologen zwingt, an diese gegebene Tatsache anzuknüpfen. Leider verlief die Aussprache schon wegen Zeitmangels unbefriedigend. Sie beriet aber mehr als alles andere, daß man nicht gewillt war, die Frage nach der Inspiration der Schrift von der Schrift selber beantworten zu lassen. Dem deutschen Theologen ist die ganze Frage nach der Inspiration die nach einem Problem, das er mit seinem theologischen Denken zu meistern sucht. Oder sagen wir es so: es drängen sich seinem theologischen Denken die Schwierigkeiten auf, die die Frage nach der Inspiration hervorruft; doch kann er sich nicht einsfältig unter das Wort der Schrift stellen, um dieser Frage gerecht zu werden, wie es nun einmal der einsfältige Christ tut. Lange ehe es zu der Aussprache über diesen Vortrag, der gegen Ende der Tagung gehalten wurde, gekommen war, wurden schon von den Teilnehmern der Tagung in Privatgesprächen über die Inspirationsfrage Meinungen ausgetauscht. Und es soll nicht unerwähnt bleiben, daß von Professoren, Pastoren und Laien die Frage nach der Inspiration immer wieder aufgeworfen worden ist, wenn auch die Verbalinspiration, wie sie von den alten Dogmatikern gelehrt wird, für überwunden erklärt wurde [von uns unterstrichen]. Dennoch scheute man sich nicht, das Wort ‚Verbalinspiration‘ zu gebrauchen, um das ‚Problem‘ in seiner ganzen Tragweite hervorzuheben. Wir konnten den Eifer, mit dem man sich mit dieser Frage beschäftigte, um so eher kennen lernen, weil wir einigen Teilnehmern an dieser Tagung schon von vornherein als solche bekannt waren, die an der Lehre von der Verbalinspiration festhielten. . . . Wie sehr uns aber das Festhalten an dieser Lehre von denen trennt, die sie fallen gelassen haben, das wurde uns offenbar, als in einer öffentlichen Aussprache der Unterschied zwischen den lutherischen Kirchenkörpern in Amerika eben dadurch gekennzeichnet wurde, daß der eine Kirchenkörper an der Lehre der alten Dogmatiker von der Verbalinspiration festhalte, während der andere diese Lehre nicht führe. . . . Und auch in einem Gespräch, das ich mit den betreffenden Theologen über diese Frage führte, kamen mir

die Unterschiede, die die verschiedene Stellungnahme zu dieser Lehre hervorbringt, wohl wie noch nie zum Bewußtsein. Wie sehr sie aber die ganze Seelsorge zu gefährden vermögen, wurde mir aus einer Bemerkung eines finnischen Theologieprofessors klar, der uns die Verhältnisse in Finnland schilderte, wo die studierende Jugend, die die Bibel nicht anders als wörtlich vom Heiligen Geist eingegebenes Buch kennt, von ihren Professoren aber weiß, daß sie alle anders stehen, von vornherein in eine nicht geringe Anfechtung gerät. Das ist in der Tat das Schwerwiegende, um nicht zu sagen das Problem, daß der einfältige Christ an der Bibel als an Gottes Wort festhält, der „gelehrte“ Theolog aber diese Lehre in Abrede stellt.“

Wichtig ist auch, was D. Peters weiter schreibt: „Diese gebrochene Stellung zur Schrift liegt einer gebrochenen Stellung zur Lehre als solcher zugrunde. Nun fragt es sich, wie weit die Einstellung des deutschen Theologen zur Heiligen Schrift dieses Prinzip bei der Erörterung der Lehre von der Rechtfertigung zur Geltung kommen läßt. Denn nirgendwo hat man eine solche Veranlassung, das Wort der Schrift nachdrücklich hervorzuheben, als wo es sich um die Rechtfertigungslehre handelt. Hier entscheidet es sich, ob ein Theolog von wissenschaftlichen Voraussetzungen an die Feststellung dieser Lehre herantritt oder ob sein Gewissen in Gottes Wort gebunden ist. Letzteres vermüßten wir auf dieser Tagung. . . . Nur so erklärt es sich auch, daß sich innerhalb der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands die verschiedensten Lehrrichtungen behaupten können und daß es nicht zur Bildung einer großen evangelischen Freikirche kommt. Die letzten Verhandlungen, denen ich in Berlin beiwohnen konnte, ergaben, daß man die drei verschiedenen Lehrrichtungen innerhalb der evangelischen Kirche nicht nur dulden, sondern auch würdigen wolle.“

Zum Schluß bemerkt D. Peters: „So konnte es einem nicht entgehen, daß es bei diesen Besprechungen doch an dem einen fehlte, was unser Gewissen an die reine Lehre bindet, nämlich das Wort der Schrift [von uns unterstrichen] und daß es nicht klar an den Tag trat, daß „Anfang, Mitte und Ende der Theologie nichts anderes ist als an Gottes Wort glauben.“ Und wiederum: „Das Fehlen einer Antwort auf die gestellte Frage (wie sei über die Frömmigkeit der Mysterienreligion und die evangelische Frömmigkeit zu urteilen, die Prof. Viekmann unbeantwortet ließ) verdeutlichte wohl mehr als alles andere, daß alle Theologie mit der irrumslosen Heiligen Schrift als dem principium cognoscendi steht und fällt. Deshalb aber auch das sola Scriptura.“

D. Pieper hat das, was hier zum Ausdruck gebracht worden ist, so gesagt: „Mit der Leugnung der Inspiration der Schrift [und damit meint D. Pieper die Verbalinspiration] gestaltet sich die Sachlage so: 1. Wir verzichten auf die Erkenntnis der christlichen Wahrheit . . . ; 2. auf den Glauben im christlichen Sinn . . . ; 3. auf das Gebet . . . ; 4. auf die Überwindung des Todes . . . ; 5. auf die Missionsmittel der christlichen Kirche . . . ; 6. auf die rechte christliche Einigkeit der Kirche, die im Glauben an Christi Wort besteht . . . ; 7. auf den Verkehr mit Gott. 8. Wir machen aus der christlichen Religion . . . eine Weisheit, die von unten her ist. . . . Wir brechen die göttliche Himmelsleiter ab, die Brücke und den Steg, der den Himmel mit dieser Erde verbindet. Kurz, alles, was uns zu Christen macht und uns als Christen erhält, lassen wir prinzipiell fahren, wenn wir von der Wahrheit abfallen, daß die Heilige Schrift durch die Inspiration Gottes

eigenes, unfehlbares Wort ist." (Vgl. „Christl. Dogmatik“, I, S. 369 f.) Wie wahr D. Pieper hiermit geredet hat, beweist auch gerade die Luther-Akademie mit ihren ungelösten Problemen und ihren unbeantworteten Fragen.

J. T. W.

**John Eliot and His "Bay Psalm Book."**—John Eliot, "Apostle to the Indians of North America," died on May 20, 1690, at Roxbury, Mass. "Last week," reports *Time* (May 20, 1940), "the historic First [Unitarian] Church in Roxbury, Mass., celebrated the 250th anniversary of John Eliot's death and the 300th anniversary of his *Bay Psalm Book*, first book published in the United States. Brilliant classic scholar, Eliot at 28 became second minister of Roxbury's First Church; eight years later, in 1640, he was one of three editors of the *Bay Psalm Book*, then titled '*The Psalms in Metre*, faithfully translated for Use, Edification, and Comfort of the Saints in public and private, especially in New England.' Critics panned it severely, said its verse constituted 'the most unique specimen of poetical tinkering in our literature.' But for a century, as edition followed edition, the Puritans liked the *Bay Psalm Book*. To his fifty-eight-year job at the First Church, Eliot added missionary work among the neighboring Indians. He learned Algonquin, a language which abounded in words like *noowoomantammnoorkanu-nornash* (our loves), preached to the Indians in their own dialect, established 14 self-governing Indian communities, converted more than 1,000 savages, of whom some 25 became preachers. Eliot's Indian converts docilely kept the Sabbath, wept over their sins, tackled theology with a will, were rewarded, at times, by apples and biscuits. In 1663 appeared Eliot's masterwork: a translation of the whole Bible into the Massachusetts dialect of the Algonquins. When King Philip's War came, Eliot's 'praying Indians' dwindled away. But his great influence over the savage undoubtedly saved many a Puritan life. John Eliot died full of years and good works at 86, outliving his wife, all but one of his six children. Said his admiring friend Cotton Mather: 'We had a tradition among us that the country could never perish so long as Eliot was alive.'"

*Time's* somewhat cynical but nevertheless appreciative comments suggest several weighty lessons. In the first place, in no popular secular United States History that we have studied is the difference between New England Separatism, Puritanism, and Congregationalism correctly stated. The Pilgrim Fathers were Separatists in the strictest sense of the term. Separatistic Puritanism was less extreme, and gradually the differences between the two disappeared and both separatistic trends were united into Congregationalism. The *Concordia Cyclopaedia* presents the subject correctly and should be consulted by those who in our schools teach United States History. Eliot, properly speaking, was not a Puritan but a Congregationalist, and so organized his Indian parishes "after the manner of the Congregational Church" (McClintock & Strong). Secondly, Eliot's amazing success among the Indians (for such it actually was) reminds us of our own manifold opportunities for doing mission-work in our neighborhood.

Let us keep our eyes open and honestly face the mission needs in

our communities. (Eliot, by the way, was also a pioneer mission-worker among the Negroes of Massachusetts!) To his contemporaries Eliot's study of the difficult Algonquin and his determination to win these Indians for Christ must have seemed fantastic; but when afterwards he stood on "pulpit rock" (not far away from our own Martin Luther Orphanage in West Roxbury), surrounded by his Indian fellow-ministers and heard by hundreds of believing Indians, his precious work was vindicated against those who regarded the Indians merely as so many Canaanites, unfit to live and therefore to be missionized by the musket and halberd.

Lastly, as *Time* rightly remarks, First Church in Roxbury is today Unitarian, and that First Unitarian Church of Roxbury should celebrate the 250th anniversary of Eliot's death and the 300th anniversary of *Bay Psalm Book* (which, by the way, was a creditable achievement for that time) is indeed more than self-contradictory. Unitarianism largely displaced Congregationalism in Massachusetts about 1800, almost two hundred years after Eliot's birth. Today as the tourist in Massachusetts studies the bulletin-boards of the ancient, graceful, churches that dot the country from Stockbridge to Boston, he is saddened by such notices as these: Founded .....; Congregational till 1800; Unitarian since 1800. There is a warning in this general apostasy for us today. The *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia* says: "The chief origin of American Unitarianism was in the Congregational parishes of Eastern Massachusetts, where Arminian tendencies began before the middle of the eighteenth century. *Aversion to creedal control and to strict adherence to Biblical teaching differentiated these churches from those responsive to the new Calvinism of the school of Jonathan Edwards.*" (Italics our own.) Modern Liberalism also finds its stronghold in "aversion to creedal control and to strict adherence to Biblical teaching," and unless we conscientiously continue in Christ's Word (John 8:31,32) and do what Matt. 10:31,32 demands of us, we shall find it hard to avoid the tragic fate which befell the Christian churches in Massachusetts about two hundred years ago. Our course lies between fanatic narrowness, of which Separatism was guilty, and liberalistic Arminianism, in the wake of which came Unitarianism in New England. J. T. M.

#### **Emergency Committee in Behalf of Religious Liberty Meets.—**

For June 11 a meeting of this committee was scheduled to be held in Washington, D.C. The "Statement of the Principles of Religious Liberty" on which the conference is standing reads:

"We believe that religious liberty is a God-given, ineradicable right, to be recognized and conserved by all human agencies that exercise authority.

"We believe that religious liberty is the enjoyment by the individual of the inalienable right to choose his religious affiliations, without coercion from any source whatever.

"We believe that religious liberty is the ultimate ground of democratic institutions and that, whenever this liberty is questioned, restricted, or denied by any group, political, religious, or philosophical, the friends of religious liberty should become greatly concerned.

"We believe in the complete separation of Church and State as set forth in the First Amendment of the Federal Constitution: 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'

"We believe that the recognition and the preservation of religious liberty by civil governments involve the acknowledgment through their constitution, written or unwritten, that religion, or the duty which every man owes to his Creator, does not come within the cognizance of the government.

"We believe that the time has come for all friends of religious liberty to consider that within the past twenty-five years one fourth of the population of the whole world has come under the sway of dictators who either delimit or completely destroy the religious liberties of the people over whom they rule, and considering this alarming fact, the friends of religious liberty should unite in its defense.

"We believe that every friend of religious liberty should exercise himself to the utmost in the maintenance of absolute religious liberty for his Jewish neighbor, his Roman Catholic neighbor, his Protestant neighbor, and for every one else. Profoundly convinced that any deprivation of this right is a wrong to be challenged, we condemn every form of compulsion in religion, whether it be exercised by a religious body or a civil state.

"We believe that the basic distinction between religious liberty and religious toleration must be clearly recognized, that the moral right to the full enjoyment of religious freedom can be consistently claimed only by those who repudiate religious coercion, and that the cultivation of a sentimental religious tolerance toward groups who within their own domain of authority deny to the individual his religious liberties should be condemned, because this tends toward the betrayal of a basic human right.

"We believe that subtle and powerful forces are now at work within our own country threatening our democratic institutions, that the surest and most effective method for maintaining security is to strengthen the hands of the people of America in the God who has granted to every man the right to religious liberty, and therefore we call upon all who serve God, all who appreciate democratic institutions, and all who desire to restrain authoritarian and totalitarian aggression wherever found to join in the defense of religious liberty."

Full information concerning the conference can be obtained from the offices of the sponsoring committee, 715 Eighth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

Let us hope that the aim of the committee is not to cast our country into war to bring the blessings of religious liberty to other nations.

A.

**Brenz und die Reformation in Württemberg.** Aus dem „Kirchl. Anz. für Württemberg“, Nr. 2, druckt die „N. C. Z. R.“ verschiedene Aussagen ab, die nach ihrem Dafürhalten „einer Nachprüfung dringend bedürftig sind, soweit sie die geschichtliche Seite anlangen“. Wir stimmen dem zu, daß diese Sätze einer Nachprüfung dringend bedürftig sind, geben sie daher hiermit (wegen Raum mangels leider nur im Auszug) weiter. Sie lauten: „1. Bei der Reformation des Herzogtums haben ein Lutheraner und ein Refor-

mierter mehr oder weniger friedlich zusammengearbeitet. Das ist ein Unikum in aller Reformationsgeschichte. Wie es dazu kam, ist nur zu vermuten. Aber die Tatsache besteht: am Anfang der württembergischen Kirche steht eine Union. . . . 3. Nimmt ein solcher [ein Lutheraner] zur Prüfung der Lehre den württembergischen Katechismus in die Hand, a) so wird er mit Befremden die ihm ungewohnt: Anordnung der Lehrstücke bemerken. Daß der Dekalog dem Glauben nicht voran-, sondern nachgestellt ist, ist in der Tat nicht lutherisch, sondern reformiert und betrifft nicht etwa bloß eine Nebensache, sondern geht auf verschiedene Auffassung der Bedeutung des Gesetzes zurück. b) Die Brenzische Erklärung der Taufe wird ihn mißtrauisch machen. . . . Für uns ist keine Frage, daß Brenz mit seiner Erklärung nicht bloß glücklicher ist im Formulieren, sondern auch evangelischer. c) An der Erklärung des Abendmahls wird ihn beruhigen, daß die wirkliche Gegenwart von Leib und Blut Christi gelehrt wird; aber es klingt doch anders, wenn Luther sagt: „Es ist der wahre Leib und Blut unsers Herrn Jesu Christi“ usw. Und wenn für Luther in den nachfolgenden Erklärungen das eigentliche Heilsgut nicht Leib und Blut, sondern die Vergebung der Sünden ist, so ist es Brenz gelungen, beides in seiner Erklärung zu vereinigen und in Beziehung zueinander zu setzen. 4. In unsern Tagen hat auf dem Tübinger Lehrstuhl ein Menschenalter lang ein Mann gewirkt, der in der Abendmahlsfrage nicht bloß seine Studenten, sondern auch seine Gemeinde unlutherisch unterrichtete, und der das Herzstück lutherischer Frömmigkeit, die Rechtfertigungslehre, so unbefangen und lech kritisierte, daß man immer wieder erschrocken ist. An seinem Grab hat ihm die württembergische Kirchenleitung für seine Lebensarbeit gedankt und ihn als einen gesegneten Lehrer der Kirche gefeiert. Das entspricht der Tradition der württembergischen Kirche von ihrem Anfang an“ (von uns unterstrichen).

Man wundert sich, wie man es wagen darf, dem theologischen Leserkreis in so wenigen Sätzen so viele historische Unwahrheiten aufzutischen, da an dem Artikel fast alles verkehrt ist und die Geschichte der Reformation in Württemberg geradezu auf den Kopf gestellt wird. Fürchtet man denn gar keine Kritik mehr? Wir haben hier nicht den Raum, auf die verkehrten Darstellungen einzugehen, möchten uns aber einen gründlichen Artikel von einem Historiker erbitten über Brenz und die lutherische Kirchenreformation in Württemberg, mit besonderem Nachdruck auf die Abweisung calvinischer Irrlehre. Als Fazit könnte gesagt werden: Brenz stand in allen lutherischen Lehren immer mit Luther gegen Römische, Reformierte und irrende, abweichende Lutheraner, besonders auch Melanchthon. Meusels Darstellung der Sache in seinem „Handlexikon“ (sub Brenz, S. 551) ist durchaus historisch korrekt: „Aber auch fernerhin trat Brenz, namentlich den bedenklichen Schwankungen seines Freundes Melanchthon gegenüber, mannhaft ein für den lauterer und vollen Sakramentsbegriff.“ Und nicht ist zu vergessen, daß Brenz kurz vor seinem Tod alle in Stuttgart anwesenden Kirchendiener zu sich kommen ließ, „damit sie den ersten Teil seines schon vor vier Jahren abgefaßten Testaments vorlesen hörten, in welchem er noch einmal sich mit aller Freudigkeit und Entschiedenheit zu Luthers Lehre bekennt und nicht nur die Greuel des Papsttums, sondern auch alle gegen die Augsburger Konfession erhobene Irrlehre, insonderheit ‚ausdrücklich und mit Namen die falsche, verdamnte Lehre der Zwinglianer‘ [von uns



unterstrichen] vertreibt und davor warnt. Er erklärte, daß er dabei sterben und genesen wolle, empfing zur Bestätigung dessen und zur Stärkung seines Glaubens mit den Anwesenden das heilige Abendmahl und ermahnte seine Amtsbrüder unter Tränen zu rechter Beständigkeit und Einigkeit“. Als Theolog reichte Brenz nicht an Luther heran, was er auch offen zugab; als Organisator war er Luther wohl überlegen. In seiner Person und seinem Wirken zeigte er oft Einzigartigkeiten, die sich nicht leicht erklären lassen. Eins aber steht fest: „Der Tradition der württembergischen Kirche von ihrem Anfang an“ entspricht es nicht, daß Lutheraner und Reformierte „friedlich“ zusammenwirken; im Anfang der lutherischen Kirche wiesen die leitenden Lutheraner einen solchen Unionismus ab. J. T. W.

„School Life,” the official organ of the United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C., reviews in the February and March, 1940, issues the present practice in America regarding the accrediting of professional schools, such as medical, dental, law, engineering, and other schools. With respect to the accreditation of theological schools in the United States and Canada the March issue reports the following:

The American Association of Theological Schools, successor to the Conference of Theological Schools and Colleges in the United States and Canada, was organized out of the older conference in 1936 by the adoption of a new constitution. Article VII of the constitution provides for the setting up of a commission on accrediting and specifies its duties as follows:

“It shall be the duty of the commission on accrediting to institute and maintain a list of accredited theological schools under standards determined by the association.”

Upon appointment the Commission on Accrediting Theological Seminaries and Theological Colleges was given “full and final authority to institute and maintain a list of accredited theological seminaries and theological colleges.”

During the next two years it carried on the work of inspecting such seminaries and colleges as desired to be considered for accrediting, and on June 30, 1938, issued its first report, containing a list of accredited theological schools.

The standards used in accrediting the institutions follow for the most part those of organizations accrediting other types of higher educational institutions. They relate to (1) admission, (2) length of courses and graduation, (3) fields of study and balance of curriculum, (4) faculty, (5) library, (6) equipment, (7) finances, (8) general tone, and (9) inspection.

The report listed 46 accredited theological schools, 3 of which are in Canada. Of this number, 11 (1 in Canada) were found to meet all the standards. The rest fall short of them, some in one particular, others in several. To the names of the latter institutions certain “notations” are appended, according to the number of items in which they were found to be deficient. In explaining its application of the standards to the schools, the report says:

“Because of the unique combination of circumstances governing the development of theological schools in the United States and Canada

it was natural and perhaps inevitable that there should be the widest differences between these schools in their organization and manner of work. These schools were not cut to a pattern as they grew, and it is the last thought in any mind now to try to make them uniform.

"But the association, by its own act, had adopted a statement of minimum standards and assigned to a commission the duty of administering a policy of accrediting theological schools with these standards as a basis. And it was discovered, as soon as data from individual schools began to be presented in detail to the commission, that very few theological schools meet the standards completely in every particular. The very first problem that confronted the commission was that of dealing both fairly and honestly with these divergencies." A. M. R.

**Strange Soviet Indignation.**—The Soviet's atheistic periodical *Bezbozhnik* is grieving bitterly over the oppression of the Greek and Russian Orthodox churches in Poland by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The Soviet, in its "righteous and liberating" invasion and division of Poland, in cooperation with Germany, discovered to its great horror and indignation that "forty per cent. of the Orthodox churches in Poland have been destroyed or converted into Roman Catholic churches." Polish legionnaires are charged with carrying off icons and church plates, with preventing the people in Polish territory from "freely fulfilling their religious obligations." In all likelihood the charge is true enough, but to assume that the "Polish legionnaires" did this solely as Catholic crusading devotees is going rather far. However, what has happened to the Orthodox churches in Russia during the last twenty years? What has become of the churches of other religious groups, the Lutheran, for instance? What has been done with their churches? What has become of their pastors? Their disappearance under a welter of calculated communist hate and godlessness has none of the chaos of war to account for it.—*The Lutheran*.

**The Original Home of the Indians.**—Those who fear a Russian invasion of our hemisphere will shiver when they learn that such a calamity has already taken place. But it was long ago; and though the occupation continues, it is nothing to worry about. Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, noted anthropologist of our celebrated Smithsonian Institute, is authority for the information that the Eskimos and Indians are essentially one people, and that they came originally from Siberia. Be relieved to know that Dr. Hrdlicka is dealing with ancient race migrations, not with political possibilities of the present. His examination of numerous deposits of ancient human remains in the Irkutsk region of Siberia has fully convinced him that they are the archeological residue of a Neolithic population which lived there 3,000 years ago, but which later vanished from that whole region. Comparing the bony structure of these remains with those of the Eskimos and Indians, he found them identical in all important characteristics with the early American remains of these people, which characteristics persist in their present-day descendants. Dr. Hrdlicka concludes that "all the native people in America, *without exception*, belong to one and the same basic race," a race that could

only come from Asia and that was "neither physically nor culturally a very ancient race." The Mormons may feel the need of revising Joseph Smith's "revelations" of the Lamanites and Nephites who inhabited this land, the more so, because he claimed they were the descendants of the lost ten tribes of Israel. — *The Lutheran*.

**Brief Items.**—The *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* reports the death of Prof. Karl Mueller of Tuebingen at the age of eighty-seven and that of Prof. Eduard Schwartz of Berlin at the age of eighty-two. The former was active as a church historian, the latter continued the work of Mommsen, giving, however, more attention than Mommsen to the study of the early Christian Church. He published a number of ancient Christian writings.

When Walter Lippmann wrote that the delegates to the American Youth Congress showed themselves "shockingly ill-mannered, disrespectful, conceited, ungenerous, and spoiled" and stated furthermore that these young people "are hypnotized by Moscow," he offered a severe indictment. *Videant consules*, etc., we say as we think about the young people in our own camp.

In Quebec a controversy is being waged on the question whether woman suffrage should be introduced in that Canadian province. The measure is opposed by Cardinal Villeneuve, the head of the Catholic Church in Quebec. According to the *Christian Century* Mr. Jean-Charles Harvey, the brilliant editor of *Le Jour* (Montreal), in a leading editorial reminded the cardinal that, while the Church is sovereign in religious matters, the State is sovereign in civil matters. He further pointed out that in 1919 Pope Benedict XV assured one of the leaders in the woman suffrage movement in England that he did not disapprove of the granting of the suffrage to English women, that the bishop of Tasmania recently commented on the fact that woman suffrage had notably improved the condition of women and especially of working women on that island, and that the rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris in 1924 had espoused the cause of woman suffrage in France. It seems the heads of the Roman Catholic hierarchy are in disagreement with one another.

From Buenos Aires comes the information that there seems to be less willingness at present to let the Roman Catholic Church conduct religious instruction in the public schools during class hours. A bill, so it is reported, has been introduced by the minister of public instruction which seeks to change the present laws. What is proposed is a course of study which eliminates the teaching of religion. This would be in keeping with the federal constitution of Argentina, according to which religious instruction can be given only outside of class hours and must be based on requests from parents, and which opposes all discrimination in favor of a certain Church. What a boon if true separation of Church and State would be achieved!

One of our exchanges submits the following distressing item: "Dr. Frederick Bartlett, Episcopal Bishop of Idaho, has sent out a warning that rural America is fast becoming paganized and that, unless the trend is halted, the Christian Church in the United States is doomed.

Father Andrew Kelly of St. Anthony's Roman Catholic Church, Hartford, Conn., calls for a united front of all religious forces against the movement toward paganism in this country. He said, 'It becomes more obvious every day that all religious forces must unite in a common battle on paganism, if for no higher motives than defense of our own possessions, among which is liberty.'

The cigaret has become a large source of Federal revenue. Last year it yielded more than \$500,000,000. The Federal revenue from all tobacco products combined totaled \$580,000,000, or more than twice the amount the Department of Agriculture estimates the tobacco-growers received for their tobacco crop. The total consumption of tobacco has increased approximately 136 per cent. in the last forty years—from 381,000,000 pounds in 1900 to approximately 900,000,000 pounds in 1939. The total population increased during this period about 75 per cent. Government tobacco specialists say that these figures do not necessarily mean that the individual consumes more tobacco now. They believe that most of the increase in consumption is because a much larger proportion of the population now uses tobacco. — *Watchman-Examiner*.

According to the *Living Church* seven Episcopal clergymen of New York, together with thirteen other members of the clergy of that city, signed a statement favoring birth control. It has often been observed that Modernism in theology is accompanied by a lack of sensitiveness as to what God teaches in the field of morals.

It is reported that the bishop of Truro, England, has refused to install a priest in his diocese who insists on the practice of the reservation of the Sacrament. The bishop is Dr. Hunkin. Some of his clergy are said to be up in arms against his decision. A serious situation indeed!

On March 26 there occurred the death of Dr. George W. Wright, who for 35 years had been a Presbyterian minister in the Philippine Islands. Among his activities is mentioned the help which he extended lepers on those islands. The chapel of San Lazaro Hospital at Manila, dedicated to the care of lepers, is called the Wright Chapel for this missionary.

On Long Island 13 members of the cult known as "Jehovah's Witnesses" (Russellites) who had been convicted of disorderly conduct in their distribution of tracts were freed by a judge of a higher court, who held that, while they had evinced "lack of manners and bad taste," they could not be punished for what they had done because of the religious liberty guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

An editorial in the *Watchman-Examiner* laments that the Spanish government bans Freemasonry. If the report is correct that the new legislation "not only bans Freemasonry but applies penalties retroactively, so that even if a man had surrendered his Masonic membership years ago, if it is discovered that he had once been a Mason, he is liable for punishment," then, it seems, some real injustice is involved. But that Freemasonry and free government are contradictory has often been demonstrated.

The falling interest rate has affected Union Seminary in New York. Its public-relations representative publishes information concerning a

drive to secure \$300,000 to "create a stabilization fund for the endowments." Most of this is now in hand. Only \$48,000 remains to be secured before July 1. A special committee of Episcopal clergy is assisting. Union Seminary will probably become in time the spearhead of the movement for union between the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches. Out of reach of all control on the part of our Church, Union Seminary has for years exercised a strong influence upon our denominational affairs. This seminary was "modernist" until that cause failed and is now strongly "liberal," "socialistic," and "union," these being momentarily the "current trends." — *The Presbyterian*.

The Seventh-day Adventists take their missions seriously, even in their Sabbath-schools. Though they are not a wealthy group, they have persistently and intelligently instructed their people, old and young alike, in missions and tithing. Each Sabbath, in every Sabbath-school, a definite missionary message is delivered, and then an offering is made for that particular purpose. Both their churches and their schools are on a tithing basis, and the entire tithe is devoted to their denominational missions, the largest proportion of which is put into foreign work. The Southern Presbyterian organ, the *Christian Observer*, sadly confesses that, though the Adventists number scarcely half the Southern Presbyterian membership, they contribute from four to six times as much to foreign missions. One small college congregation of 150 members is said to have given \$7,000 for missions in one year. Just what would be the ratio of other denominations in such a comparison—say our own, for instance? — *The Lutheran*.

According to the official Catholic Directory there are now 21,403,136 Catholics in the United States. The number of converts during the past year is stated to have been 73,677.

In New York, it seems, the forces of law, order, and morality won out in their attempt to prevent the appointment of Bertrand Russell as teacher in the City College of New York. The budgetary provision for his professorship has been stricken out. The newspapers reported recently that a judge declared Russell, prominent radical, on account of his views on marriage and morality, ineligible for the position of professor in that college.

On April 7 there died, 76 years old, Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, and of the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning in Philadelphia.

The *Bay Psalm Book*, whose tercentenary is observed this year, was the first book to be printed in what now is the United States. The importance of the work can be gaged somewhat by the fact that 27 editions of it were printed in New England and that in Old England itself the work became quite popular, too. Speaking of its significance, Henry Wilder Foote, writing in the *Christian Century*, says: "It is the earliest literary monument of the English-speaking colonies, and it was an important contribution to the religious life of its time. For more than a century it was the cherished collection of worship songs of our colonial ancestors."

A.

---

## Book Review — Literatur

---

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

**A Commentary on Exodus.** By Herman J. Keyser, B.D. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 451 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$3.50.

This commentary, we are assured by the publishers, "is an aid to bulwarking the faith of the fathers." . . . "Its purpose is to establish the credibility and authenticity of the passages in the book long considered untrustworthy." The author rejects the theories of radical criticism of the now almost defunct Wellhausen school. He calls attention to many archeological discoveries and to a number of passages in the text which are incompatible with radical criticism. Yet he is far from accepting the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch as we have it in our Bible. In his opinion the Hexateuch is a composite book. "Early contemporaneous records were collected and arranged first by the Priest, known as the priestly strata, which, according to the present writer, began with the official installation by Moses on Sinai." (P. 15.) Joel and other eighth-century prophets got their information and learned their art of writing from the "school of the priests located at the various centers both in the North and the South," who in turn obtained their teachings from "the records made by their predecessors. These records included our early books—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Joshua." . . . "If Exodus did exist, minus minor glosses, before the age of Samuel, how does it happen that the prophet historians, J from the South and E from the North, have their works incorporated in the book as we now have it?" The author informs us that after the division of the kingdom "there was begun what is common to all peoples, a partisan history of Israel taken from the original scroll of Exodus, some of which we have incorporated in our Hexateuch, but a good deal of which has been lost. Likewise, in the South, the prophet historians known as J set about adapting the original scroll to partisan purposes just like their brethren of the North whom they detested. Somehow, the original scroll was lost, so that at some period preceding Deuteronomy, probably after the fall of Samaria in 721 B. C., editors known as Rje [the compiler of the J and E records] began to rewrite the book from the materials at hand. These were J, E, and P. The impulsion to do this must have been great. What caused it, except but for the apparent unholiness of Israel, we do not know. . . . The present writer feels that Rje judiciously selected sections from P, J, and E, properly to appease both the priestly and prophetic parties, who would have considerable followings, as well as differentiating between J and E to give additional evidence, witness, and what a later writer called a 'cloud of witnesses'" (pp. 41, 42).

Deuteronomy is placed "sometime earlier than 621 B. C.," p. 19. Ezekiel chapters 40–48 came from an author "who lived during the profuse apocalyptic era (c. 175 B. C.), against whom the author of Ecce-



siastes cries out, 'And further, by these, my son, be admonished: of making many books there is no end'" (p. 22). He takes this position because thereby "the much maligned priests, preexilic and postexilic, will have been restored to the honorable position in scholarly circles that they have always held in religious circles" (p. 22). Still, the author speaks of divine inspiration and calls Exodus the Word of God. How he can combine the two positions is beyond us.

The author constantly compares the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch and gives valuable information on many archeological discoveries which throw light on the geographical and historical references in Exodus. Throughout the book the Reformed, and particularly the Calvinistic, theology is in evidence; so, e. g., in the note on chap. 7:3-7: "Pharaoh will be obdurate, stubborn, made so by Jehovah's progressive measures." (P. 129.) On chap. 7:13 he writes: "'Hardened Pharaoh's heart' is equivalent to 'made him stubborn,' adamant." The word used here by Moses does not bear this translation. It means "was or became hard." The proof-reading has been rather loosely done.

THEO. LAETSCH

**Kommentar zum Alten Testament.** Herausgegeben von Prof. D. Ernst Sellin. Band XVI, 3: „Die Klagelieder“, übersetzt und erklärt von D. Dr. Wilhelm Rudolph. A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig. 74 Seiten 6½×9½. Preis: RM. 3.50.

Derselbe Verfasser, dem wir die Auslegung des Buches Ruth in dem bekannten großen Sellinschen Kommentar zum Alten Testament verdanken, hat auch die Klagelieder behandelt, und was wir im Maiheft, S. 392 f., über seine Erklärung des Büchleins Ruth sagten, gilt auch im allgemeinen von seiner Arbeit über die Klagelieder. Die Behandlung ist dieselbe; erst folgt auf zwölf Seiten eine Einleitung, die die üblichen isagogischen Fragen erörtert, dann folgt eine wörtliche Übersetzung in besonderem Druck, philologische Bemerkungen in kleinerem Druck und schließlich die Auslegung. In den einleitenden Fragen behandelt er die in den Klageliedern angewandte Kunstform des Alphabetismus, infolgedessen jeder Vers der einzelnen Kapitel mit einem Buchstaben des hebräischen Alphabets der Reihe nach beginnt und darum jedes Kapitel 22 Verse nach der Zahl des hebräischen Alphabets umfaßt (das dritte Kapitel 66 Verse, weil immer drei Verse mit demselben Buchstaben beginnen). Er weist mit Recht ab, daß diese alphabetischen Akrosticha aus dem Schulunterricht stammen, um das Alphabet einzulernen, und sagt: „Daß die Klagelieder für den Unterricht gedichtet seien, weil der Lehrer mit seinen Schülern zugleich den Stil der Leichenklage einüben wollte, macht aus den mit Herzblut geschriebenen Liedern voll schweren Ernstes eine bloße Stilübung.“ (S. 3.) Doch meint der Verfasser, daß der Sinn dieser Kunstdichtung bis heute noch nicht befriedigend erklärt sei. Aber ist nicht die alte Auffassung, daß diese Form von den Dichtern (Ps. 9 und 10, 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145, Spr. 31, 10–31) gewählt sei, um die betreffenden Stücke als etwas Vollständiges abzurunden und darum die Zahl des Alphabets erschöpft, durchaus befriedigend? Der Verfasser nimmt für die Entstehung der Klagelieder die richtige konservative Zeit an, nämlich bald nach der Zerstörung Jerusalems, im Jahre 587, und jedenfalls längere Zeit vor der Wiederherstellung der Stadt, im Jahre 536. Er führt meistens in guter Weise in das Verständnis der Lieder ein, löst scheinbare Widersprüche und hebt mit Recht als etwas Wichtiges hervor, daß drei der fünf Kapitel

(1, 2, 5) mit einem Gebet schließen und auch das dritte und vierte mit einem hoffnungsvollen Ausblick enden. In bezug auf den Verfasser meint er freilich, daß es nicht Jeremias sein könne, sondern ein Gefinnungsgenosse des großen Propheten; aber die Gründe, die er anführt und auf die wir jetzt nicht näher eingehen können, erscheinen nicht durchschlagend, und die alte Überlieferung, daß Jeremias der Verfasser sei, die schon Ausdrück gefunden hat in der uralten, wahrscheinlich aus dem Hebräischen stammenden Überschrift der Septuaginta, „Und es geschah, nachdem Israel gefangen und Jerusalem verwüstet war, setzte sich Jeremia weinend nieder und dichtete folgendes Klagelied über Jerusalem und sagte“, die auch in neuerer Zeit von Keil, v. Orelli und andern vertreten wird, hat guten Grund. Rudolf hebt selbst hervor, daß mit Sprachvergleichung und Sprachstatistik, die manche Ausleger für Jeremia, andere gegen ihn als Verfasser in Anspruch nehmen, nur „wenig anzufangen ist“ (S. 8). Bei der Übersetzung berücksichtigt er immer auch das Metrum, und als Überschriften und Inhaltsangabe der fünf Kapitel hat er folgende Stichworte: Kap. 1: „Siehe wie ich verachtet bin!“ Kap. 2: „Jehovah hat's getan“; Kap. 3: „Das Vorbild Jeremias“; Kap. 4: „Niemand blieb verschont“; Kap. 5: „Laßt uns werden wie früher.“ Diese Stichworte sind ganz zutreffend außer bei Kap. 3; da können wir dem Verfasser nicht beistimmen, wenn er meint, daß Jeremia hier von sich selbst rede, sondern das „ich“ ist kollektiv zu fassen und geht auf die Einwohner Jerusalems, wie darum auch dieses „ich“ mit „wir“ abwechselte. Vgl. B. 1—24 und 48—66 und den „wir“-Abschnitt B. 40—47. Gut wird die theologische Seite, daß wir so sagen, der Klagelieder betont, daß neben dem verdienten Gericht Gottes über sein Volk und seine Stadt immer auch die göttliche Gnade hervorgehoben wird, die Gott einem bußfertigen Volke schenken will; und diese Buße ist nicht eine Leistung, sondern eine Gabe Gottes. Vgl. Kap. 5, 21; 3, 22—24, 31—33. Wir schätzen diesen kurzgefaßten Kommentar als ein Werk über ein kleines, vielfach zurückgesetztes Buch der Heiligen Schrift, das auf der Höhe der Zeit steht, wenn wir auch manche Ausstellungen machen müssen. Uns bleibt eben immer noch als wertvollster neuerer Kommentar derjenige von Keil. Und was das Buch der Klagelieder unserer Zeit zu sagen hat, ist bei anderer Gelegenheit ausgeführt worden. Vgl. CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, 4 (1933) 161.

L. Fürbringer

**The Holy Spirit.** A Study of His Person, Ministry and Operations.

By J. C. Massee, D. D., LL. D. Fleming H. Revell, New York. 144 pages, 5¼×7¼. Price, \$1.25.

This monograph contains twelve chapters on the person and the work of the Holy Spirit, covering both the Old and the New Testament. The first five chapters broadly treat the doctrinal and the last seven the practical aspect of the subject. The author distinguishes, and rightly so, between the Holy Spirit's gift of using unlearned languages and the special gift of "tongues," found, for example, in the Corinthian Church. The reviewer, however, cannot agree with the writer in saying that the "Holy Spirit is not given in answer to the prayers of men" (p. 15), for that is clearly proved by Luke 11:13, despite the arguments to the contrary. When it is said that on Pentecost "the kingdom of Israel, an earthly kingdom, has given place to the kingdom of God on earth" (p. 79), the spiritual nature of God's kingdom is ignored, and the meaning of Pentecost is misunderstood. To describe the Baptism of

the Holy Ghost as the "communication of God's life and nature to man" (p. 125) is, to say the least, ambiguous. The Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit must not be identified with the *unio mystica*, nor must that union be taken in a pantheistic sense. Other statements likewise challenge criticism; the book demands discriminate study. Nevertheless, it sets forth in a helpful outline a much-neglected but very important doctrine, and pastors who wish to place more emphasis on this doctrine by special lectures will gain much by its perusal, especially from its fine outlines and its practical applications. Dr. Massee is a well-known Fundamentalist, connected as guest lecturer with the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, and a ranking evangelist, Bible-teacher, and author. He is certainly right when in the Introduction he declares: "There is a distressing and hurtful ignorance which now seeks to turn the ministry of the Spirit away from the things of Christ to the experiences of men, real or supposed" (p. 6).

J. THEODORE MUELLER

**Ethik der Liebe.** Von Wilhelm Lütgert. Verlag C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. 294 Seiten 6½×9½. Preis: Kartontiert: RM. 9; gebunden: RM. 11.

"Die christliche Religion ist die Religion der Liebe." So hebt dies Hohelied der Liebe an. Das soll nicht besagen, daß die Liebe die Hauptsache in der christlichen Religion ist. Denn der zweite Satz lautet: "Das Evangelium ist die Botschaft von der Liebe Gottes, die in Christo Jesu offenbar geworden ist." Der Sinn unsers Buches ist: Weil das Christentum die Religion des Glaubens ist, so weiß nur die christliche Religion etwas von der wahren Liebe, der Frucht des Glaubens; und im Christentum kommt die Liebe zu ihrem göttlichen Recht. Und nun wird in meisterhafter Weise das Lob der christlichen Liebe gesungen. Es wird dargelegt, worin das innere Wesen der Liebe besteht und wie sie allen Tugenden den rechten Gehalt gibt und darum alle menschlichen Verhältnisse und Tätigkeiten adeln und verklären kann. Der Verfasser (der vor Drucklegung des Buches aus diesem Leben geschieden ist), ein Meister auf dem Gebiet der Philosophie und Psychologie, hat es verstanden, die in diesen Wissenschaften herrschenden Begriffe seinem Thema nutzbar zu machen. Manches davon stimmt allerdings nicht. Aber im allgemeinen kann man sagen, daß der, der sich das aneignet, was hier auf Grund der Heiligen Schrift und nach Anleitung des kleinen Katchismus in so einfacher, edler Sprache über das Wesen und Wirken der Liebe gesagt wird, ein bereicherter Prediger der Liebe sein wird.

Wir geben einige Proben. "Die christliche Ethik faßt sich zusammen in das Liebesgebot. Es ist das eine Gebot, das alle Gebote in sich schließt. Liebe ist die Erfüllung des Gesetzes. Sie ist der Grundwille, der alle Pflichten erfüllt, alles Gute umfaßt. Liebe ist das Gute, die eine und einzige Tugend." (S. 1.) "Die Liebe beginnt mit Achtung. Darin, daß man den Nächsten in seiner individuellen persönlichen Eigenart gelten läßt und anerkennt, besteht das Verständnis für ihn, und dies wird als die erste und größte Wohlthat empfunden. Wer sich verstanden fühlt, ist dankbar. . . . Wenn es richtig ist, daß alle Liebe auf Gegenliebe rechnet und um sie wirbt, so verfährt sie nicht nach der Regel *Do ut des*, sondern sie sucht und schätzt auch in der Gabe des andern ihn selbst. . . . Die Liebe ist etwas anderes als die 'schenkende Liebe'. Denn mit dieser verbindet sich ein Überlegenheitsgefühl, ein Selbstbewußtsein, durch welches der Nächste herabgesetzt wird zu einem bedürftigen Empfänger, der in sich selber nichts ist und

von dem Geber völlig abhängig ist. . . . Liebe muß vor allen Dingen fähig sein, zu beobachten, zu hören, zu schweigen und zu verstehen. Die Überlegenheit zeigt sich nicht darin, daß man sich selbst ausspricht und mitteilt, sondern daß man es versteht, den Nächsten dazu zu bringen, daß er sich ausspricht und mitteilt. Dies wird nicht durch irgendeine pädagogische oder seelsorgerliche Technik erreicht, sondern allein durch das unwillkürliche, unreflektierte Interesse an den andern. Wie im ganzen geistigen Leben des Menschen, so ist auch in der Liebe die erste, tiefste, ursprüngliche Fähigkeit die Empfänglichkeit, ein Akt des Vernehmens. . . . Der Grundzug der christlichen Ethik besteht darin, daß alle Tat Liebe sein soll. So wenig der Mensch um seiner selbst willen da ist, so wenig ist es seine Tätigkeit." (S. 90 ff.) Aus dem Kapitel „Demut“: „Gemeinschaft ist nur dann möglich, wenn die einzelnen, die sich zur Gemeinschaft zusammenschließen, bereit sind, sich einzuordnen. . . . Die Einschränkung des Geltungsstrebens ist erst dann Demut, wenn sie auf einer Einschränkung der Selbstschätzung beruht. Das innerste Wesen aller Liebe ist eine Schätzung des Nächsten. Schon darum ist die Liebe Demut. Denn die Schätzung des Nächsten begrenzt die Selbstschätzung. Jede Selbstüberschätzung führt zur Unterschätzung der andern, das heißt, zu einem lieblosen Urteil über sie. . . . Die Demut gehört als Grundhaltung des Menschen zum Evangelium Jesu. Sie beruht auf der Erkenntnis der Wertlosigkeit, der Entbehrlichkeit alles menschlichen Wirtens vor Gott, Luf. 17, 10. . . . Durch das Evangelium von der Rechtfertigung des Sünders allein aus Glauben ohne die Werke des Gesetzes wird alles Rühmen ausgeschlossen. . . . Der Kampf gegen die christliche Ethik in der Gegenwart richtet sich besonders gegen die christliche Demut wie gegen das Keuschheitsgebot. Wie das Keuschheitsgebot, so sei auch das Demutsideal unnatürlich, eine Hemmung der normalen, ungebrochenen Haltung des gesunden Menschen. Demut sei Schwäche. . . . Das Bekenntnis der Demut lautet nicht: Ich bin nichts, sondern: Ich bin alles durch und darum für Gott.“ (S. 145 ff.)

Allen Ausführungen des Buches kann man freilich nicht beistimmen. Auf Seite 152 heißt es: „Darum nennt Paulus die Gnade Rechtfertigung. Der begnadigte Sünder ist gerecht und darum aufrecht.“ Was soll das heißen? Seite 194: „Aus vergebener Sünde entsteht Liebe. Durch sie wird auch der Fall des Menschen eingeordnet in seine Erlösung.“ Das ist nicht korrekt geredet. Seite 29: „Die Erlösung besteht in der Erweckung des Willens zur Liebe.“ Das ist falsch. Auch dies: „Der Glaube an den unsichtbaren Gott entsteht im Kinde dadurch, daß es Erwachsene sieht, die Gott als Realität behandeln, besonders im Gebet.“ (S. 193.)

L. h. Engelder

**Swedish Contributions to Modern Theology.** By Nels F. S. Ferré. Harper & Brothers, New York. 250 pages, 6×8½. Price, \$2.50.

We are sure that this book will be warmly welcomed in many theological circles of our country, since it offers a comprehensive, yet fairly brief and intelligible view of the present-day predominant trends in modern Swedish theology. The author, himself the son of a Swedish pastor, is now professor-elect of theology and philosophy at the Andover Newton Theological School. A Liberal, he nevertheless endeavors to evaluate the positive elements in modern Swedish theology, represented especially by the theological school of the well-known Lund University; though it may be questioned whether a professed Modernist can duly estimate and appreciate conservative emphases in their whole scope.

Broadly speaking, Swedish theology, like ancient Gaul, may be divided into three parts: a distinctly liberal wing, represented by the Uppsala school; a distinctly conservative type, represented by the High-churchly Rosendahl movement and the pietistic Schartau movement; and, lastly, a mediating trend, championed by the Lundensian school, in which among others such men as Aulén, Nygren, and Bring are outstanding. According to Ferré "the Lundensian theology is best understood as the resurgence of historical Christianity, as a reaction to the indefiniteness of a confused Liberalism" (p. 23). At the same time, while "Lundensian theology is a return from all relativisms to the absolute assurance of religion," it is not a return to "the Biblical literalism of the past. In this respect the movement represents a compromise with traditionalism and is suspect in certain orthodox circles as 'radical to the point of stagnation'" (p. 29). Modern mediating theology in Sweden may be said to go back to Luther by way of Barthian and similar present-day German theologies. From Luther it borrows only its necessary major premises; substantially, it is a "philosophical theology." "Theology is a strictly scientific discipline with a logical-descriptive method. Its field is the object of faith which it finds in the positive religions" (p. 46). It insists upon being recognized as a "science in good and regular standing" (p. 47). Preeminent in this theology is "the relation of God to man" (p. 95 ff.), and here the major premise is that God is *agape* [Luther: "eitel Liebe"] (p. 105). It is "His *essentia* to love" (p. 109). In contrast with *agape* stands *eros*, "man's effort to ascend" (p. 119). Without going any farther into details on this score, we may say that we here have a *Religionsphilosophie*, which loses itself in endless questions and problems and thus wastes precious time, properly belonging to the study of Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions, and which in the end overthrows both the *sola scriptura* and the *sola gratia*. For those who wish to acquaint themselves with present-day trends in Sweden, Ferré's book will be very helpful, though Nygren, Aulén, and others whom he quotes ought to be studied in the originals. Most of the quotations are brief and are presented out of their context, so that often they do not present a clear picture of the original. Ferré's language is sufficiently clear for the average student of theology to follow, while the subject-matter is relatively simple, for which we thank both Ferré and the theologians whom he quotes as his authorities.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

**Instructions for Non-Catholics before Marriage.** Rev. Anthony L. Osterheimer. The Dolphin Press, Philadelphia, Pa. 232 pages, 4×5½. Price, 60 cts.

These *Instructions* are intended for non-Catholics who are contemplating marriage with Catholics and present the chief doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church from the viewpoint of the inquiring non-Catholic. Pastors who have no text-book on Roman Catholic doctrine may welcome this brief compend on Roman doctrine. The booklet is of interest especially because it clearly shows Rome's position on mixed marriages. Canon 1064 in the New Code Canon Law (1917) reiterates Rome's prohibition of entering into a mixed marriage

without episcopal dispensation. Such dispensation is granted only when the non-Catholic has given the ante-nuptial promises, viz.: 1. that he will recognize the Catholic principle of the indissolubility of marriage; 2. that he will not prevent the Catholic party from exercising his faith; 3. that all children, of either sex, born to the couple shall be baptized and brought up in the Catholic faith, even though the Catholic party should be taken away by death; 4. that marriage shall be performed before a priest. (Pp. 11—15.) This fourfold promise requires not only the signature but also the intention of living up to the promise. (We understand that the Milwaukee diocese requires the promise to be in legal form.) The third promise is motivated as follows: The Catholic Church is the only true Church and must demand that Catholic children are raised as Catholics; and since most non-Catholics believe that all churches are equally good, they will find it quite easy to sign this pledge. It is evident from these *Instructions* not only that Rome is interested in having the non-Catholic party understand why the Catholic spouse observes the various Roman practices, but that Rome is determined to gain the non-Catholic for the Catholic faith before marriage is consummated. Rome understands only too well that the prenuptial promise to "join the Church after marriage" is frequently not kept and therefore makes every effort to gain the non-Catholic before marriage.

F. E. MAYER

**Mother's Book.** Forty-two Meditations for Expectant Mothers. By Karl Ermisch. Good Samaritan Book Store, Fargo, N. Dak. 87 pages, 6×8.

This little paper-covered volume offers material for which many pastors have been waiting. It seems that many expectant mothers find it difficult to attend public services. Besides, they need, in addition to the comfort and encouragement given them by faithful pastors, the regular consolation of the Word of God. The little meditations offered here by Doctor Ermisch, a total of forty-two, will certainly serve the purpose for which they are intended, for they offer food from Scripture on the thoughts which are most likely to be found in the heart of a Christian woman during pregnancy. If, as we hope, the first edition is soon exhausted, we also hope that a subsequent printing will offer a more substantial binding for the little volume.

P. E. KRETZMANN

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

*From the Abingdon Press, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago:*

**Dramatic Moments in the Life of Jesus.** By Ralph P. Claggett. 168 pages. Price, \$1.00.

*From the Methodist Book Concern, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago:*

**When Are We Patriotic?** By Frances Nall. 175 pages, 5½×8½. Price, \$1.00.

*From Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:*

**Eighteen Chorale Improvisations for the Organ on Advent and Christmas Hymns.** Composed by Martin H. Schumacher. 40 pages, 9½×12. Price, \$1.50.